

NOBIS

TREASON

TITLE 42

DISCOVERY

\$25

CORAM
REPLEVIN

DEFAULT

TRESPASS

REMEDY

WRITS

PAPER



*Thine arrows are sharp in the
heart of the King's enemies.
(Psalms 45:5)*

**EXCERPTS FROM
HOWARD GRISWOLD**

ARROWS

TO
LEVY

LIE N

CONTRACT

U.C.C.

PETITION

A

FOREWARD

The format of this information is different than most that you have seen. The differences were placed there for the very purpose of helping you to understand and think through the huge problems of trying to expose the truths that exist today. For those of you that might be coming upon these ideas for the first time we hope these changes will help. Now it will be up to you to break away from the "sitcoms" or the "play-offs" or any of the rest of the numerous intentional distractions from the truth.

One way that this writing is different is that the "glossary" is placed up front where it belongs. It should be read first. If, after reading it, there is a word that you do not understand, read it again. The material that follows cannot be of any use to you if you do not know the meanings of the words of which the ideas are made. Get a law dictionary and look up the terms yourself. Go to your local municipal or law library and study these unfamiliar terms. Browse through the U.S.C.S., U.S. Codes. You will be amazed to find what they have hidden from you.

Another way that this work differs from most is that the important points in a sentence or paragraph are put in the margins of the pages for quick reference. This makes some of the more important ideas easier to find. Do not, however, assume that these notes in the margin are the only points to be made in the paragraph or that they are the most important ones. They are not. They are the ones that we feel are very important and should not be neglected. You may have a reason to pick a completely different point to be made in that paragraph and you should write it in the margin yourself for easy reference.

There has also been an index provided which catalogs the emphasized points in the margins. Again, this is for assisting you. Add your points to this index too.

Finally, there are some sample forms in the back to help with seeing what may be done with this information.

None of this work is an attempt to advise or council and each is on his own as to how an offense or defense is to be established. More help will come later with revisions and new "Paper Arrows" as they are found.

The present is not a key to the past, nor to the future. Do what you can.

Patriot Bookstore
P.O. Box 2368
Anderson, SC 29622
803-225-3061

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

(It is a good idea to be seated before reading many of these definitions.)

ABROAD. Beyond the seas. Not subject to maritime law. Out of admiralty jurisdiction. A free, natural person lives abroad.

ARTIFICE. A DEVICE used to defraud.

BANC. A bank. A bench. A full court. A court full of filed property deeds is a bank. (The court just may be the "real" bank.)

BANK. A banc. A bench. A full court. A court full of filed property deeds is a bank.

BOUNTY. A premium given. Compensation paid.

CIVIL DEATH. A person who has lost all of his civil rights. A person still possessing "natural life" but is considered civilly dead as to his civil rights.

In some states persons convicted of serious crimes are considered to be civilly dead and may lose the right to vote, the right to contract, and the right to sue and be sued.

A corporation which has formally dissolved or become bankrupt becomes civilly "dead".

(Lends new meaning to the term "born again".)

CIVIL LAW. Distinguished from "natural law" and "international law". Referred to as "municipal law". (Government Law.) Roman Law. Distinguished from "common law" which is American law. Not American law. Foreign law.

CLAIM. To take possession of a thing that was not yours before the claim.

(Why would anyone want to "claim" their children if the children already belonged to them? Maybe the children belong to another, the State.)

CONSTRUCTIVE. Synonymous with "legal" and is in contradistinction to "lawful". (See legal fraud.)

CONSTRUCTIVE FRAUD. Actual fraud. Any breach of duty which gains an advantage to the person in fault or anyone claiming under him, such as his agent, that misleads another to his prejudice. To violate public or private confidence.

CONTRIBUTION. One TORT-FEASOR (law-breaker) is responsible for the debts and losses of the rest of the group of JOINT TORT-FEASORS (law-breakers). They are all LAW-BREAKERS together. An example is SOCIAL SECURITY. All persons in the system are liable for the debts and losses of all the others in SOCIAL SECURITY and they are all presumed to be law-breakers as such.

CORPORATION. A PERSON with a perpetual life. A FICTION. A COLORABLE PERSON. The subject of the 14th Amendment. It cannot move from its place of birth without first getting permission and a license. A person born by an act of legislation.

CLASSIFICATIONS OF CORPORATIONS

1. - PUBLIC vs PRIVATE (most important distinction) *
2. - ECCLESIASTICAL vs LAY
3. - STOCK vs NON-STOCK
4. - AGGREGATE vs SOLE
6. - SUBSIDIARY vs PARENT
7. - FOREIGN vs DOMESTIC
8. - ELEEMOSYNARY vs CIVIL

- * The federal government has set up PRIVATE corporations under federal law. They are known as federally chartered corporations. They are defined and listed in 36 U.S.C.S.(Title 36). American Red Cross is one. Girl Scouts is another. V.F.W. is also one. There are 52 in all. Look it up in your local library as a place to start on the trip of exposing the fraud.

DAMAGE. The word is to be DISTINGUISHED from its plural form "damages". It is loss, injury, or a deterioration caused by the negligence, design, or accident of one person to another, in respect to the latter's PERSON or PROPERTY.

DAMAGES. The word is to be DISTINGUISHED from its singular form "damage". The compensation in MONEY for a loss or DAMAGE.

FRAUD. An INTENTIONAL PERVERSION of the TRUTH for the purpose of inducing another, in reliance upon the perversion, to part with some valuable thing belonging to him or to SURRENDER A LEGAL RIGHT.

Synonymous with "bad faith", dishonesty, perfidy, unfairness, infidelity, faithlessness, etc.

FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT. Hiding or suppressing a material fact or circumstance which the party is legally or morally bound to disclose.

FRAUDULENT CONVERSION. Receiving into possession money or PROPERTY of another and fraudulently withholding, converting or applying the same to or for one's own use and benefit, or to use and benefit of any person other than the one to whom the money or property belongs.

FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCE. The conveyance or transfer of property, the object of which is to defraud a creditor, or hinder or delay him, or to put such property beyond his reach.

Most states have adopted the Uniform Fraudulent Conveyances Act.

INCLUDE. This is a word of "limitation" as well as a word of enlargement when used in statute. Thus, we see the phrase "including, but not limited to" to show that it does not mean a limitation in that instance. There would be no need for that phrase if the word always meant an enlargement. Synonymous with "only" when used in that sense.

So, when you see the word "includes" in statute it may mean only that item which follows the word. "Including the District of Columbia" means "ONLY the District of Columbia."

From the Latin word "includere" which means "to shut" or "to enclose."

INDIVIDUAL. Does not mean "human being" in most cases. Means a corporation or an association such as American Bar Association.

INFORMER. This term is synonymous with PROSECUTOR. The definition shows that it gives anyone the power and the RIGHT to bring ANY and ALL actions against any PERSON, in or out of the government, including corporations, public and private, which includes municipal corporations. See RELATOR.

BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY, 4TH EDITION:

INFORMER. A person who informs or prefers an accusation against another, whom he suspects of the violation of some penal statute.

COMMON INFORMER. A common PROSECUTOR. A person who habitually ferrets out crimes and offenses and lays information thereof before the ministers of justice, in order to set a prosecution on foot, not because of his office or any special duty in the matter, but for the sake of the share of the fine or penalty which the law allots to the INFORMER in certain cases. Also used in a less invidious sense, as designating persons who were authorized and empowered to bring action for penalties.

BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY, 5TH EDITION:

INFORMER. A person who informs or prefers an accusation against another, whom he suspects of the violation of some penal statute. An undisclosed person who confidentially volunteers material information of law violations to officers, and does NOT include those who supply information only after being interviewed by police officers, or who give information as a witness during course of investigation. GORDON v. U.S., C.A.FLA., 438 F.2d 858, 874. Rewards for information obtained from INFORMERS is provided for by 18 USCA SEC.3059

BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY, 6TH EDITION:

INFORMER. An undisclosed person who confidentially discloses material information of a law violation, thereby supplying a lead to officers for their investigation of a crime. JACKSON v. STATE, WYO., 522 P.2d 1286 1288. This does NOT include persons who supply information only after being interviewed by police officers, or who give information as witnesses during course of investigation.

INSTRUMENT. A written document.

LAWFUL FRAUD. Cannot exist. A contradiction of terms. An oxymoron. An impossibility. (Legal fraud can exist.)

LEGAL FRAUD. Fraud by construction. Takes place all the time.

MALA PROHIBITA. Acts which are made criminal by statute but which, of themselves, are NOT criminal. Used in contrast to MALA IN SE which refers to acts that are wrongs in themselves such as ROBBERY.

This has no place in common law, only in Roman Law that is used in America today.

MAY. Usually employed to mean optional. Not mandatory. Discretionary.

MUNICIPAL. Pertaining to the governmental affairs of a state, nation, or people. Does not always mean city or local government. May mean federal government.

MUST. This word has several meanings, it does not always mean mandatory. It is often used in a directory sense and is a synonym for "may". Can be used in a permissive sense rather than a mandatory sense.

NATION. A race of people. (Surprise!)

NON-RESIDENCE. Residence "beyond the limits" of the particular jurisdiction.

In ECCLESIASTICAL LAW, the absence of spiritual persons from their benefices (rank or public office).

NON-RESIDENT. One who does not RESIDE within jurisdiction in question; not an inhabitant of the "state of the forum".

NON-RESIDENT ALIEN. One who is neither a resident nor a citizen of this country.

PEONAGE. A condition of servitude compelling persons to perform labor in order to pay off a debt. This is prohibited by the 13th Amendment. (Notice it did not use the word "people" and may be referring to corporations only.)

PEOPLE. A state; as the people of the state of New York. (Notice the small "s" used in the word "state" and it does not mention "persons".)

Also a nation in its collective and political capacity.

PERSON. This does not mean "human being", in most cases. It can be assumed to always include a corporation. A corporation is a person as referred to by the 14th Amendment.

* The 14th Amendment EXPRESSLY applies to "person".

ARTIFICIAL PERSON. A CORPORATION or a FICTION. The offices of government.

NATURAL PERSON. A "HUMAN BEING." In statute the term "natural person" must be used to refer only to a living, breathing human.

PRIVATE CORPORATION. As used in Title 36 U.S.C.S. means a corporation established under FEDERAL law, not state law as we would be led to believe.

Examples are the American Red Cross, Boy's Clubs, Girl Scouts, American Legion, Jewish War Veterans, American Olympic Committee, and 46 others listed in 36 U.S.C.S.

PROSECUTOR. An INFORMER. A RELATOR. One who instigates a prosecution against a party whom he suspects to be guilty.

* PRIVATE PROSECUTOR. Any person. Not an officer of government. (Everyone is a prosecutor and should take the places of the ones hired by the governments.)

PUBLIC PROSECUTOR. An officer of the government, such as the district attorney. Hired by the government to do the job that a private prosecutor would do.

PUBLIC. Does not mean all the people.

PURVIEW. Not preamble.

RELATOR. An informer or PROSECUTOR.

ROMAN LAW. Indifferent with CIVIL LAW in America. That means that civil law in America is ROMAN LAW and is FOREIGN LAW.

SHALL. This word is generally imperative or mandatory and denotes obligation. The word in ordinary usage means "must". (Remember that "must" did not always mean mandatory.)

* BUT it may be construed to be the equivalent of "may" where no right or benefit to any one depends on its being taken in the imperative sense, and where no public or private RIGHT is IMPAIRED by its being taken to mean "may".

STATE. When written with a small "s" it means all the inhabitants of a given land. When the "s" is capitalized it means the corporate body politic or the government only and could refer to a territory or enclave of the federal government. The definition that is to be used in the statute will be given as each statute is stated. It will be different from one statute to another.

ULTRA VIRES. Beyond the scope of the powers of a corporation (government). An "ultra vires" act of a government is one that is beyond powers conferred upon it by law.

WILL. As a verb it commonly has the mandatory sense of "shall" or "must". See "shall" or "must" above.

WORLD. All persons who may have a claim or interest in the subject matter. Not the same as the "earth".

IMPORTANT CASE CITINGS

(Comments in parenthesis.)

City of Riverside v. Mc Laughlin, 111 S.Ct. 1661 (1991):

Cannot hold anyone more than 48 hours without a probable cause hearing or a bail hearing or an arraignment.

(One must "sign in" for the bail hearing or arraignment, so do not sign.)

Lynch v. Household Finance Corporation,

The dichotomy between personal liberties and property rights is a false one. Property does not have rights. People have rights. The right to enjoy property without unlawful deprivation, no less than the right to speak or the right to travel, is in truth a "personal" right, whether the property in question be a welfare check, a home, or a savings account. A fundamental INTERDEPENDENCE exists between the personal right to liberty and the personal right in property. That rights in property are basic CIVIL RIGHTS has long been recognized.

(Property rights are civil rights and a civil rights suit can be brought for the taking of any property under 42 U.S.C. sec. 1983. Property is tangible and intangible such as thoughts, a signature, or a fingerprint.)

**** INDEX & NOTES ****

*** A ***

ABNEGATION - 27
ACTIONABLE FRAUD - 24
ADVERSE POSSESSION - 53
ADDRESS - 45
AFFIDAVIT - 48, 50
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE - 30, 40
AGENTS - 14
AGREEMENT REVOKED - 42
ALIENS - 39, 40
ALLODIAL TITLE 50, 51
"AMERICAN JURISPRUDENCE" (AM. JUR.) - 13
ANARCHY - 11, 20, 41
ARGUE FRAUD - 28
ARTIFICE - 24
ATTORNEY GENERAL, U.S. - 46

*** B ***

BAIL - 37
BANK - 53
BANKRUPTCY COURT - 10
BARRON v BALTIMORE - 6
BILL OF RIGHTS - 5, 6, 8
BIRTH CERTIFICATE - 9
BLOOD TEST - 49
BODY OWNERSHIP - 19
BOOTH, JOHN W. - 11
BORN - 11

*** C ***

CAPEAS - 48
CAR OWNERSHIP - 19
CHURCH & STATE - 2
CITIZEN - 2
CITIZEN STATUS OF CORPORATION - 5
CIVIL RIGHTS - 12
CIVIL RIGHTS CASE - 26
CLASS OF PERSONS - 27
CLEARFIELD DOCTRINE - 26
COLORABLE PROCESS - 11
COLORABLE TITLE - 52
COLOR OF LAW - 11
COLOR OF LAW ACTION - 44
COMMON LAW DEFENSE - 29
COMMON LAW LIEN - 15
COMPLAINT BY A PRISONER - 40
CONSENT - 37, 39
CONSTITUTION - 6, 7, 10

CONSTITUTION IS FOR GOVERNMENT ONLY - 7
CONSTITUTION IS FRAUD - 6
CONSPIRACY - 16
CONTRIBUTION - 18
CONTRACTS - 24, 26
CONVERSION - 21
CONVEYANCE - 52
CO-CONSPIRATOR - 16
CORPORATION IS A CITIZEN - 5
COUNTERCOMPLAINT - 16, 17, 29, 32, 34
COUNTERCOMPLAINT IS MANDATORY - 29
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE vs. MC LAUGHLIN - 34
COURT AS CO-CONSPIRATOR - 16
CRIMINAL ACTION - 42, 46
CRIMINAL COMPLAINT AS A SEPARATE ACTION - 46
CRIMINAL COMPLAINT FORM - 34

*** D ***

DECEIT - 23
DEED - 10
DEFAULT - 54
DEFECTIVE CONVEYANCE - 52
DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS - 14, 39, 46, 49
DE REIMER, DAVE - 47
DISCRIMINATION - 39
DISMISSED CASE - 34
DOING BUSINESS - 13
DRIVER'S LICENSE WAIVED RIGHTS - 44
DURESS AS AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE - 40

*** E ***

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (E.P.A.) - 47
EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE - 14
EVIDENCE - 41
EXPATRIATE - 9

*** F ***

FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM - 14
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (F.B.I.) - 46
FEDERAL INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS ACT (F.I.C.A.) - 18
FEDERAL RESERVE CORPORATION - 11
FEUDAL TITLE - 51
FIFTH AMENDMENT - 6
FILED CLAIMS BENEFIT GOVERNMENT - 52
FORCED CONTRACTS NOT ALLOWED - 24
FOREIGN CORPORATION - 1
FOREIGN INCOME - 33
FORTY-EIGHT HOURS - 34
FRAMERS - 10
FRAUD - 5, 6, 16, 22, 24, 28
FRAUD IN TRAFFIC ISSUES - 35
FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCE - 21
FREEDOM WHEN FEE PAID - 20

*** G ***

GOVERNMENT DESCENDS TO LEVEL OF CITIZEN - 25, 26

*** H ***

HAFER vs. MELLO - 32
HOLDER - 20
HOLDER IN DUE COURSE - 20, 50
HOUSE OWNERSHIP - 19
HUMAN RESOURCES - 19

*** I ***

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF - 50
INDORSEMENT - 19
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE CODE - 27
IMMUNITY OF OFFICIALS REMOVED - 12, 26, 32, 45
INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND (I.M.F.) - 8
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF - 50
INJURY - 23, 24, 25
INSTRUMENTS - 9, 17, 25, 26
I.R.S. FORM 1040 - 33
I.R.S. FORM 2555 - 33
I.R.S. PARTY TO FRAUD - 16

*** J ***

JACKSON, ANDREW - 10
JURISDICTION - 31, 35

*** K ***

KAHL, GORDON - 9

*** L ***

LEVY IS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES ONLY - 28
LIABLE BY SIGNING - 18
LIABLE TO YOU - 47
LIBERTY - 21
LINCOLN, ABE - 11
LYNCH vs. HOUSEHOLD FINANCE CORP. - 44

*** M ***

MAIL FRAUD - 23
MAKER CAN BORROW - 19
MASONS - 10
MANUFACTURER'S STATEMENT OF ORIGIN (M.S.O.) - 10
MC LAUGHLIN: see COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE vs. MC LAUGHLIN
MC NALLY v U.S. - 22
MICHIGAN CASE - 15

MORTGAGE VOID - 43
MOTION TO QUASH - 16
"MUST" - 52

*** N ***

NATURAL PERSON - 40
NEW YORK re. MERRIAM - 31
NOTICE AND DEMAND - 27, 53, 54
NOTICE OF DEFAULT - 54

*** O ***

OBLIGATION TO TELL YOU - 30
OFFICER OF CORPORATION - 34
OPERATION OF LAW - 42
ORDER OF COMMITMENT - 39
OTHER PERSON - 12, 13
OTHERSON v U.S. - 12

*** P ***

PENSIONS - 9
PEONAGE - 47
PEOPLE OF UNITED STATES - 7
PERMITS - 30
PERSONAL CAPACITY FOR SUITS - 46
PERSONHOOD - 40
PLAINTIFF - 25
POLITICAL ISSUE - 13
PRESENTMENT (U.C.C. 3-504) -
PRESUMPTION (U.C.C. 1-201) - 17, 29
PROBABLE CAUSE HEARING - 34
PROPERTY TRANSFER - 27

*** R ***

RECISSION - 42, 43
RECUSED, JUDGE - 16
RELIGIOUS LAW - 2
REMEDY - 6
REPUBLIC - 3
RESIDENCY - 26, 32
REVOCATION OF SIGNATURE - 37, 39, 43
RIGHT NOT TO PARTICIPATE IN COURT PROCEEDINGS - 39
RIGHT TO TRAVEL - 21, 40
RIGHT TO TRAVEL COMPLAINT - 40
ROADS - 21
ROMAN LAW - 2
RULE 8c - 29
RULE 12 - 15, 28
RULE 13 - 29
RULE 19 - 36
RULE 55 - 54

*** S ***

SCHEME - 23
SECURITY INSTRUMENTS - 25
SELF GOVERNMENT - 4
SEPARATION OF POWER - 5, 7
SHAM - 23
SHAPIRO v THOMPSON - 40
"SHOULD" - 52
SIGN IN FOR JURISDICTION - 36
SIGNATURE - 18
SILENCE - 25
SOURCE OF INCOME - 38
STATE, FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS - 1
"STATE" IS OFFICE ONLY - 32
"STATE OF" - 31
STATUS - 33
STATUTE OF FRAUDS - 16
SUE WHERE THE PARTY IS LOCATED - 32
SUPREME COURT IS BANKRUPTCY COURT - 10

*** T ***

TAX - 13
TICKET FROM E.P.A. - 47
TIME MUST BE GIVEN TO RESCIND SIGNATURE - 42, 43
TITLE - 10
TITLE 15 - 42
TITLE 18 - 46
TITLE 26 - 27, 31
TRAFFIC TICKET - 42
TRESPASS - 22
TRICKED TO COME IN TO CONDUCT BUSINESS - 5

*** U ***

UNLAWFUL CONVERSION - 21
UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE (U.C.C.) - 15, 27, 47
UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE IN I.R.S. CODE - 27
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY - 46
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL - 46
UNITED STATES IS A CORPORATION - 1
UNITED STATES IS A STATE - 1
UNLAWFUL CONVERSION - 21
U.S. vs. HERRON - 22
U.S. vs. TWEEL - 25

*** V ***

VOTE - 7

*** W ***

WACO, TEXAS - 9
WAIVER OF RIGHTS - 42, 43, 44
WALL vs. KING - 43, 44

WEAVER, RANDY - 9
WHERE TO SUE - 32
"WITHOUT PREJUDICE" - 41
WORLD BANK - 8
WRIT OF EXECUTION - 54
WRITS - 15
WRONG DEFENSE - 13

*** Y ***

YOU BECOME THE PLAINTIFF - 25
YOU TELL THE COURT - 16, 17, 30

**** CODE CITES ****

15 U.S.C. SEC 1693 - p. 42
18 U.S.C. SEC 242 -- p. 46
26 U.S.C. SEC 911 -- p. 31
26 U.S.C. SEC 6323 - p. 27

FRAUD EVERYWHERE

EXCERPTS FROM HOWARD GRISWOLD

Many of the things that we have been taught in the past by teachers, preachers, parents, and people bringing us the news, just to name a few, have been found to be wrong. The people teaching us may not have intended to teach us wrong, it was that they did not know that the information was wrong. It was not due to intentional spreading of wrong information, although there is a lot of that also. It is just that nobody is aware of the truth.

I have found that a lot of the things that WE have taught over the last twenty years have been wrong. So we will not place blame on anyone, but try to learn more and go forward with what we can confirm. A lot of our mistakes were due to misconceptions carried around all of our lives.

One misconception was that we were all CITIZENS of the United States and anybody who told me different would have a fight on his hands. But it turns out that I never worked for the United States in my life. I have only visited there about five times in my whole life. I know that now, but when I was a kid I would have sworn I LIVED in the United States.

All the way up until a few years ago I still would have sworn I LIVED in the United States. But I have found out a lot of things in the last few years due to the research of many patriotic independent researchers. And one of them specifically discovered a court case to help confirm my thinking.

U.S. IS
FOREIGN
CORPORATION
TO STATES

That case is New York re. Merriam, 16 S.Ct. 1073. This court case verified in one sentence all the things I thought I was finding out about that were reversing the beliefs that I had previously held. The statement out of the case is, "The United States government is a FOREIGN CORPORATION with respect to a state."

FEDERAL
GOV'T. IS
A STATE

Another case that helps explain the confusion is Enright v. U.S., D.C.N.Y., 437 F.Supp. 580, 581. That case explains that the Federal Government is a "state" bound by all of the provisions of the Interstate Agreement on Detainers.

First of all, whoever thought that the government was a CORPORATION? I thought it was a government, formulated by a God-given constitution. I doubt if God had anything to do with that. But that is what I previously believed.

A CORPORATION is a group of people who get together for the purpose of making a profit. GOVERNMENT is a cover-up for the means by which the group will make the profit.

GOVERNMENTS and RELIGIONS are a lot alike in their business endeavors. Religions are created to cover up man's inability to have knowledge and his insecurities. The word RELIGION means to do things simultaneously, consecutively, and consistently. It

means to do the same thing everyday the same way; to be consistent.

RELIGIOUS LAWS

Governments were CREATED by RELIGIONS. All LAW goes back to something called ECCLESIASTICAL laws. Religions created the laws. But God did NOT CREATE religions. I cannot find the word mentioned in the Bible. There is nothing in there about religions. There IS something in there about GOVERNMENTS. But that was not found in the original Hebrew text. The newer books mentioned governments, but the older ones did not.

CHURCH AND STATE

These newer books COMBINED the government with religion. Then we found this governmental structure known as the "separation of Church and State" which actually means the "togetherness of Church and State." The Church CANNOT exist without the LICENSE from the State. Again we can see how backwards everything seems to be when studied in some detail.

Where is the SEPARATION? There is no separation if one has to be SUBSERVIENT to the other through LICENSING. Something is wrong in all of this when it is twisted around so much as to be backward from what is said to what is meant.

These wheels were put into motion thousands of years ago and there may or may not be someone causing the confusion to survive today. But because of the confusion we are wandering aimlessly.

One of the things we have learned is that this thing called the UNITED STATES is a CORPORATION. And it is FOREIGN to the PEOPLE, YOU and ME. Which means I am NOT a CITIZEN of it, although I have been told to believe just that.

ROMAN CIVIL LAW

In school we were taught Civics which was based on Roman Civil Law and comes from the Latin word, "civitas", which means citizen. It is "Roman Citizen" Law. WE actually HAVE a Roman Empire government which is a duplication of the ancient Roman Empire. If you study the Roman Empire and how its government works you will see the relationship between that system and the United States' system today. You can look it up and check it out for yourself.

Most law students will tell you that they study Roman Civil Law in law school. Why would they study FOREIGN law? Why not study American law in an American law school?

We are living under Babylonian Law or Roman Law which is the same thing. So, in order to understand what is going on in our law today we had to go back to those ancient systems and come forward to comprehend the theory behind the function of the law.

Ancient English feudalism is the forerunner of our system of real property. The property ownership in this country is feudalistic in nature. But if you use the feudal terms of the Old Law, from the Common Law of England, in the Modern Law courts they will reply that they do not know what you are talking about. They do not use those old words. They have new words that have twisted the meanings even further. The meanings are what have been changed so tremendously and that has lead us astray from knowledge.

CITIZEN

Back in grade school the nuns said, "Now we are going to learn how to be GOOD CITIZENS." Then they handed out this little book called

CIVICS. They never said that I was a CITIZEN. But they sure did imply it by giving me the book and telling me we are going to learn how to be a GOOD one. It is very interesting how we can be led to believe something but we are never told it. Deception is all through this system.

One of the things that we first memorized was the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States." It is still in my memory. I still remember doing it. I have not done it lately. I do not have any allegiance to the United States or their stupid flag.

For those who think that it is a disgrace to talk that way about the AMERICAN flag they might be surprized to know that the pledge of allegiance says, "... the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands". What is "it"? "It" is the United States which is standing up for the Republic, America. The United States, the government, was to be the protector of America. The government was set up to defend America, the people. The government created a flag which is the flag of the government, not the flag of America. America does not have a flag. The most important word in there is REPUBLIC.

What is a REPUBLIC? I looked all over the place for the definition and could not find more than a few words, no matter what dictionary I used. When the political powers do not want something known they just barely cover it in the available definitions. If they want you to be totally confused the definition is three pages long. If they want it hidden it is only a sentence or two.

REPUBLIC

Corpus Juris Secundum, a law encyclopedia, under the word "government", explains that a REPUBLICAN form of government is a form of government in which any other form of government is the government. That seems a little amusing, and surprising.

It did not matter if the USSR, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, had socialism and the United States had capitalism. They both were "United" and had a REPUBLICAN form of government. One system of politics was totally different from the other system of politics, but they were both "United" REPUBLICS. The REPUBLICAN form of government allowed either system. They were both the same.

Russia has a REPUBLIC. America has a REPUBLIC.

But we claim that here in America this government is a DEMOCRACY. Russia claimed that they had a SOCIALISTIC form of government. And that could very well be fitted into the definition of a REPUBLIC when it said that a REPUBLIC allows any form of government that the country wants.

The District of Columbia is the "home" of the DEMOCRACY. That is the home of the CORPORATION called the "United States of America". CORPORATE AMERICA has its own laws.

General Motors is a corporation that has its own laws for its workers. One of the laws is that you have to show up for work at 7:30 every morning during the week. If you do not you are fired. If you show up at 10:00 every morning you will get your pink slip and out the door you will go.

DO YOU HAVE A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO WORK?

THE CONSTITUTION GIVES SOMEBODY THE RIGHT TO WORK but I am not sure who that is yet. But since the constitution was not written into the General Motors contract that was signed, there was no constitutional right to work at General Motors.

But I have NEVER showed up on time for work at General Motors and I always go to work at 9:00. However, General Motors has not fired me yet, and I have been doing this for years.

THEIR LAWS DO NOT APPLY TO ME.

The laws of the CORPORATION known as General Motors do not apply to me because I do not have a CONTRACT with them and I do not WORK there.

The laws of the CORPORATION known as the United States do not apply to me because I do NOT have a CONTRACT with them and I do not WORK there either.

SELF-
GOVERNMENT

In the Corpus Juris it explains that there is a separation of power between the PEOPLE of the LAND and the FEW PEOPLE who create and maintain the GOVERNMENT. It also explains that as a REPUBLICAN form of government it is SELF-REGULATING. The constitution gives the US Government the power to make all necessary laws for the United States, that is, for ITSELF!

Now when we go back to that court case that stated that the United States is a FOREIGN CORPORATION, and we realize that a CORPORATION is a private entity, and that if you do not WORK FOR THEM, and that their laws do NOT APPLY TO YOU, then you can begin to understand the concepts on which this country was built.

These GOVERNMENT LAWS did NOT apply to the PEOPLE in the states. They only applied to the PEOPLE and properties that the GOVERNMENT OWNED and CONTROLLED. It is no wonder, then, that people from all over the world wanted to come to a country where the government could not dictate the way for the common people to live.

The knowledge of what I just told you was prevalent in the early years of this country and was common knowledge. But the dying off of generations and the lack of knowledge being passed down to the next generation caused this awareness of how the government functioned to be lost. By the 1930's this knowledge was almost COMPLETELY DESTROYED. These basic ideas, that were once common knowledge to all, had all but vanished.

No one was teaching the people about these basic concepts of government in America. As the people became less aware of how the government was to be operated, the government created for ITSELF a NEW AMENDMENT. The men in the government usually accomplish this act by causing an upheaval of some sort in order to give a CAUSE and REASON to make the NEW AMENDMENT.

The great upheaval that the men in GOVERNMENT CAUSED was what we

call the CIVIL WAR. From that war came three amendments. They were the 13th, 14th. and 15th. They are sometimes referred to as the WAR AMENDMENTS.

The 13th Amendment dealt with SLAVERY. The 14th allowed a NEW type of CITIZEN. ELECTIVE FRANCHISE was the issue in the 15th Amendment.

CITIZEN
STATUS
OF
CORPOR-
ATIONS

But the REAL purpose of the three WAR AMENDMENTS and the series of events around that time, including the death of Abraham Lincoln, the Civil War, and other upheavals, was to create a STATUS of CITIZENSHIP for CORPORATIONS. That was the whole purpose.

The 14th Amendment did not create Civil Rights for the dark-skinned people, as we all have been lead to believe through history books and such. That was the COVER-UP. It was a FRAUD!

The 13th Amendment did not FREE any SLAVES at all, but it did ENSLAVE the free!

FRAUD
EVERYWHERE

I found a book in the town library, in Newport, Tennessee, called "FRAUD EVERYWHERE". It was written just after the Civil War and explains the WAR AMENDMENTS, and the war itself, and what these things did to the society back then. It explained the FRAUD by showing copies of newspaper articles and other documentation. The author explained that the actions of the ENTIRE legislature was nothing but FRAUD.

If they knew back then that the government was FRAUDULENT, why was it ALLOWED to continue?

SEPARATION
OF POWER

How mislead we are. There is a REPUBLICAN form of government in America with a SEPARATION of power between the PEOPLE of the STATES and the PEOPLE of the GOVERNMENT!

Now it works BOTH WAYS. If the government has no power to extend its laws to the PEOPLE of the STATES then the PEOPLE of the STATES cannot tell the PEOPLE in the GOVERNMENT how to MAKE THEIR laws. It is a double-edged sword.

The PEOPLE in the STATES knew back then that they did not have the power to tell the PEOPLE in the GOVERNMENT what to do. They said THEN what I say TODAY, "I do not care what Washington D.C. does. I do not care WHO gets elected president. I do not care what laws THEY make. None of it applies to me. I do not care if they are a gigantic FRAUD as long as they do not COME OUT HERE and bother me!"

If they do COME OUT HERE, out of their JURISDICTION, and bother me, there has to be some way to RETALIATE.

TRICKED
TO COME IN

If the PEOPLE in the GOVERNMENT had no regulatory power over me and I had no power over them directly, but they tricked me and coerced me into doing business with them and making agreements that I knew nothing about, they must have known that THEY were doing something WRONG. They must have known that if they could not

come out here and do business with me that they had to figure out a way to make me COME IN and do BUSINESS with them. The PEOPLE in the GOVERNMENT had to know they were doing this and they had to KNOW it was WRONG. And the unique thing about government WRONGDOERS is that they always set up a WAY for them to RIGHT what is WRONG. ALWAYS.

Finally, I decided that somewhere in the 14th Amendment there must be REMEDY for me to get BACK OUT of doing BUSINESS IN THERE with the PEOPLE of the GOVERNMENT, to get BACK OUT of the mess of the 14th Amendment that they built to ENTRAP us. It IS there and I found it, and that is what I am going to show you here today.

REMEDY

THE REMEDY IS TO EXPOSE THE FRAUD!

EXPOSE
FRAUD

I am going to show you how to EXPOSE THE FRAUD CREATED BY THE 14th AMENDMENT by using the REMEDY AVAILABLE IN THE 14th AMENDMENT itself. I will show you how to GET OUT from underneath what this government created by using the REMEDY they set up for all to use.

CONSTITUTION
IS A FRAUD

I have said before, many times, that the Constitution of the United States was one of the biggest FRAUDS ever perpetrated on the face of the earth. Indeed it was! The concept that we believe that it APPLIES to US and GIVES US RIGHTS is also a FRAUD.

I have upset a lot of people with that statement and one man got so upset that he began a search to prove me wrong. I made him so mad that it caused him to GET UP and GO WORK to find out how he got where he was on his own instead of just listening to me. And he found a court case while he was attempting to prove me wrong. The case was Barron v. Baltimore, 32 U.S.243.

BARRON
v.
BALTIMORE

Mr. Barron sued the City of Baltimore because they did some excavation work on some land right behind his building which was located on the waterfront. He had a marine business where he brought in ships and unloaded them. The City of Baltimore's excavation work "silted" the harbor to the point where ships could not go in and out of his wharf.

He filed a claim against the City and stated that the City had effectively taken his property without giving him compensation for it. He claimed that violated the 5th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

5TH AMEND.
ONLY
LIMITS
GOV'T.

Here is what the judge had to say about the 5th Amendment to the United States Constitution and the constitution itself:
"The provisions of the 5th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, declaring that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation, is intended SOLELY as a LIMITATION on the exercise of the POWER by the GOVERNMENT of the United States."

Why would they refer to the first ten amendments as a "Bill of Rights"? The judge just said that the 5th Amendment was a "limit of power." Why not call it a "Bill of Limitations"?

The only answer that comes to mind is that the GOVERNMENT must be the one with the RIGHTS. IT has those RIGHTS all the way up to the LIMITATIONS spelled out in the first ten amendments. The "Bill of Rights" is only for the PEOPLE in GOVERNMENT!

The judge went on to say, "It is not applicable to the legislation of the states." But the 14th Amendment altered that statement later on, since this case was in 1833. The 14th Amendment in 1868 supposedly extended the "Bill of Rights" to the states. I am going to show that it still had nothing to do with ME and YOU. If it was intended solely as a limitation of the exercise of the power of the government of the United States then the "Bill of Rights" and the constitution were intended for the United States only. They were NOT intended for the PEOPLE of America who were NOT CITIZENS and NOT RESIDENT within the government. IT DID NOT APPLY TO THEM!

CONSTITUTION ORDAINED FOR GOV'T ONLY The judge continued, "The constitution was ORDAINED and ESTABLISHED by the PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES for THEMSELVES, for THEIR OWN government, and NOT for the government of the individual states." That pretty much limits it. It goes right back to what I told you this other definition in Corpus Juris said about it being SELF-REGULATING. It only had INTERNAL power to make laws and regulations FOR ITSELF!

GOV'T HAS INTERNAL POWER ONLY THE GOVERNMENT HAS THE POWER TO REGULATE ITSELF, AND ONLY ITSELF. IT DOES NOT HAVE THE POWER TO REGULATE THE PEOPLE IN THE STATES. THE GOVERNMENT HAS INTERNAL POWER ONLY, UNTIL A BUSINESS DEAL IS ESTABLISHED AND A CONTRACT SIGNED.

PROMOTE THEIR INTERESTS He goes on to explain further, "Each state established a constitution for ITSELF, and in each constitution is provided such limitations and restrictions on its powers as its particular government's judgement dictated. The people of the United States formed such a government for the United States as they supposed BEST ADAPTED to their SITUATION and BEST CALCULATED to promote THEIR INTERESTS."

THAT FITS THE CORPORATE UNDERSTANDING VERY WELL! Their interests were to go into business and make a profit. They established a CORPORATION and called it the UNITED STATES.

PEOPLE OF UNITED STATES The PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES are the PEOPLE IN THE GOVERNMENT only. It is just that simple! They are NOT the SAME as the PEOPLE of AMERICA. They have a different STATUS.

SEPARATION OF POWER If the government had included all the people in America it would have stated "We the people of AMERICA" at the beginning of the preamble of the constitution. Instead it reads as "We the people of the CORPORATION known as the United States" at the beginning of the preamble. See, there is a definite SEPARATION OF POWER.

VOTE You and I, that do not work for government, are not entitled to do things that the people in government do. We, you and I, are not entitled to vote. Why should we even be interested in voting? What do we care what laws they make if their law does not apply to us? No wonder we are not entitled to vote.

But a real tricky way to get you involved with doing business with the government is to offer you the "right" to vote. If you do not know any better you might even accept it. (If you have the "right" to vote the government could not offer it to you, it can offer only "privileges" and they can be taken back. Rights cannot be taken back. Rights CANNOT be given. They CAN be waived.) As soon as you accept the offer to vote you sign your name on a piece of

paper which goes in the government file, and now YOU ARE IN THE GOVERNMENT! Now you are REGISTERED to vote. By deception, most anything can be accomplished. They accomplished getting you into the government when you would not have done so otherwise.

"BILL OF
RIGHTS"
FOR GOV'T
ONLY

"Whatever was best suited to THEIR SITUATION and whatever was best calculated to PROMOTE THEIR INTERESTS was all the PEOPLE of the GOVERNMENT had in mind. The powers they conferred on this government were to be exercised BY ITSELF". It had NO power over the states. "The limitations on the power, if expressed in general terms, were naturally and necessarily applicable to the government CREATED by the INSTRUMENT." The "Bill of Rights" applies to the government ONLY, and the PEOPLE in government.

Therefore, YOU AND I DO NOT HAVE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS!! Only the PEOPLE in the government have constitutional rights.

People used to tell me that I was out of my mind for saying that. They would ask, "What do you think we have this wonderful Christian government for? It is to give us rights!"

I would say that I do not agree with that. I think that God gave us rights BEFORE the government ever EXISTED. The government is the one that needed the people to let the government create some right of their own to apply to themselves, in the government. It is at the LEISURE of the PEOPLE in the states that the government was created in the FIRST PLACE and LET the people of the government exist. If the PEOPLE do not like it they can abolish the government.

America can only be free again if the CORPORATION known as the United States were ABOLISHED. I did not expect to get much help in that effort until they picked a new "Wizard" over there in Oz. The new "Wizard of OZ", Billy Clinton, is running AMERICAN CORPORATIONS out of the country at record rates. He is running the biggest portion of HIS own government's tax base out of the country. That is revenue to support the United States of America Incorporated. He has done more in a few months to destroy the United States than all of the rest of the anti-government movement has done in the last fifty years. He may very well destroy about 98% of the CORPORATION called the United States in his first term alone.

WORLD BANK
AND IMF

There may be some chaotic times ahead as this happens and becomes apparent. There will be more police control to prevent the fall, but it looks inevitable. Property will be confiscated with a fight if necessary. There are reports that United Nations troops are being trained at the abandoned military bases around the country to help with the control of the people when all property is taken for payment of the debt to the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and the Bank of England. There are reports of troops all over the country and on each border, Mexico and Canada. Something seems to be in the making here.

The money system is about to collapse and the American people are striving and struggling to keep it from collapsing. The people do not realize that this system is bad for them and that if they would quit struggling so hard to support it we could get away from it sooner. The people in the government are trying to make it collapse but we will not let it. They will win over one day and we

will all be issued "new" money and our property will be placed in the hands of the HOLDERS entirely. But if we keep struggling for what we think is ours they will have to bring in the troops and make us quit struggling and then keep the peace in America with numerous troops in the streets.

The PEOPLE that inhabit this country, America, may not wake up until it hits them where it hurts.....their cars. Yes, their cars. You can do anything to the American people, even charge over 20% interest on borrowing to pay for luxuries and necessities alike. You can take their kids away in buses to public brain laundries. You can even make them pay taxes and insurance that amount to over 80% of their pay. But do not fool with their cars. When that happens look out.

PENSIONS

The other thing to look out for is the day that all the pensions are cut off. The government is hoping that before anything big happens that the majority of WW II and Korean veterans will be dead and gone so that they will not have to face them and their dependents. But there are other types of pension holders and they will be just as mad, but they may not have proven battle records and may not know how to fight in hand-to-hand combat.

But a little lady with a big iron skillet is still a force to be faced. There may be millions of them too.

WACO

WEAVER OR KAHL

The Rodney King incident shows that the "justice" system in the United States should be spelled, "just-us". It is just FOR THEM, the police and others in the government at all levels. Those officers should all be in jail for the treatment of anyone in the manner that they treated Rodney King. The scum that beat him up should answer for it. But it is THEIR LAW and is made FOR THEM. The "HOLOCAUST AT WACO" proved that when they murdered innocent Americans there and nobody stopped them. Who will stop them in other towns around America the next time? Who stopped them at Randy Weaver's place? What about Gordon Kahl? HE WAS BURNED ALSO.

BIRTH CERTIFI- CATE

But the government wants us to think that they are taking care of us. The government even created a Department of Human Resources which is where your mother placed your body at birth. Yes, your mother signed a BIRTH CERTIFICATE in YOUR name and placed YOUR BODY into the government vault. You were identified by your name on the paper. If you were missed there, they set up a "Socialist" Security System for you to sign your own self into their vault at the Social Security Administration building.

NOW YOU ARE PROPERTY OF THE GOVERNMENT!

INSTRU- MENTS

Babylon has taken away the children. They control the bodies of the children and everyone else that fills out the forms for the government. Babylon has taken all property, or "stores", as the Bible refers to them. It has been accomplished through paper documents known as INSTRUMENTS.

EXPATRIATE WHEN 18

For those that want out of the JURISDICTION of the United States the law has been provided for anyone to be able to EXPATRIATE when they reach the age of 18. Look it up in the Corpus Juris Secundum under "CITIZEN".

DEED IN
OTHER
HANDS

The deed to your land is not in your hands. It is filed in the public records in the court. The government has it! The government is the "holder in due course". You just do the maintenance of it to keep the value up. You just manage it for the bank or the government if the bank is paid off.

TITLE IN
OTHER
HANDS

The title to your car is not in your hands. It is filed with the State and they allowed you to register it while they hold the ORIGINAL TITLE, not the "Certificate of Title" that you have in your top drawer at home. "Certificate" of Title" and the "true", original title are two very different pieces of paper. Which one do you have? Do you have your car? Most people do not. The State does because they hold the "true title". Look at it and see for yourself.

M.S.O.

The Manufacturer's Statement of Origin, or MSO, is the actual bill of sale and title. The dealer gives the MSO to the bank or the government when you buy the car. Ask him about it.

CONSTITUTION
DOING
VERY WELL

The constitution is alive and well and does not need any help from the patriotic groups around that want to "restore the constitution", or "help preserve the constitution", or "repair the constitution". None of these things can be accomplished and do not need to be. The government is living under it very well and prospering at our expense. It is very healthy as far as they are concerned. And since it was written FOR THEM, BY THEM, it is doing very well.

BANKRUPTCY
COURT IS
"SUPREME"
COURT

In Article II, the Congress had the power from the very beginning to create uniform BANKRUPTCY laws. What a set up. What are we living under today? We are living under BANKRUPTCY. The framers put that there so that the situation of BANKRUPTCY could exist and put ALL LAW under the Uniform Bankruptcy Laws, and the Bankruptcy Court, in order to control and monopolize every aspect of business in America. That has happened. The one court that CANNOT be overruled in the United States is the Bankruptcy court. Its decisions are SUPERIOR TO all other courts. It CANNOT be overruled. THAT MAKES IT THE "SUPREME COURT" in THE UNITED STATES!

FRAMERS
AND
MASONS

The FRAMERS of the Constitution were not these "nice" little old men that had OUR BEST INTERESTS at heart. They were a bunch of schemers with a flair for "intrigue" and "cabal" that surrounded their every meeting, and was included in every document written by that bunch of "ring twirlers".

There may have been a couple of good people that got involved. They were not all bad. Without the good men involved the Grand Scheme would have been accomplished much sooner. But do not refer to them as the "Founding Fathers", and suggest good intentions on ALL their parts.

JACKSON

Andrew Jackson was one of the good guys that came along and in the 1830's, threw out the bankers, and abolished the National Bank. By

doing that he delayed the country's falling into the BANKRUPTCY for another 100 years. He was a good, decent man that got into the presidency and threw the moneychangers out.

LINCOLN

Years later they tried again to put this country into debt and eventual bankruptcy with the Civil War. Abraham Lincoln saw what the bankers had planned and stopped them at every turn. He even issued the "Greenbacks" to take the debt out of the hands of the lenders. He would not agree to setting up their National Bank and borrowing their worthless paper money at 20% interest and putting the United States into huge debt quickly at that rate.

BOOTH

So he threw them out and they sent one of their hit men over here and Lincoln was murdered. John Wilkes Booth was an employee of the Rothchild Bank of England. That was the banking house that Lincoln had refused. Lincoln did not set up a central banking system in America, and delayed the take-over again.

The War Amendments had not been ratified by the proper number of states while congress was in session and the attempts to gain control of this country through FRAUD continued. Andrew Johnson attempted to stop them but only succeeded in slowing them a few more years.

FEDERAL
RESERVE
SYSTEM

The fight had been going on for a long time and finally the bankers came up with a FRAUDULENT scheme to trick the public and politicians into agreeing with the debt system and BANKRUPTCY. They set up the Federal Reserve which is not FEDERAL and has no RESERVES. This was the central banking system that they had been trying to establish since before the formation of the Republic. This was a central banking system but could not be called that out in the open. Everyone who immigrated from Europe knew that the central banks there were the cause of high taxes and debt burdens. The people would have revolted before setting up a central bank here. So it was called the Federal Reserve Banking System to conceal its true identity and sell the idea to the people.

COLOR OF
LAW

Color in legal terms means not real. "Color of law" means that it is not real law. Anything that is not real and is held out to be real involves FRAUD.

COLORABLE
PROCESS

The 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments were COLORABLE since they had not been properly ratified in the 1860's. The 16th and 17th Amendments were never properly ratified, with NO quorum present in congress, in 1915. And if you look back at the ratification of the constitution that whole process was also COLORABLE, and makes the instrument a FRAUD.

THERE IS FRAUD EVERYWHERE!

If the passage of these ideas and documents had to be done by using FRAUD and trickery there must be something wrong with all of the "laws" that were just mentioned, including the constitution.

ANARCHY
NOW

There is no law in this country anymore. The law dictionary defines ANARCHY as the ABSENCE of LAW. The law dictionary defines the COLOR OF LAW as being that which has the appearance of law but is NOT real LAW at all. If it is not REAL law then it is the ABSENCE of law. We do not have a DEMOCRACY. We have ANARCHY now.

CIVIL
RIGHTS

Over the years I have slowly come to believe that citizenship is not a good thing. And I have told you that civil rights applied to citizens. CIVIL means emanating from civil governments. So, civil rights would come from civil governments. If the government gives you something it can always take it away and you should not want to accept these rights from the government and do business with them if you had the RIGHTS in the first place.

I thought that it was not a good idea to use these civil rights laws to try to fight them. So I looked at every other possible means that I could find such as common law complaints, civil complaints, and civil and criminal procedures. I even used these foolish constitutional rights claims, common law rights claims, and substantive and God-given laws and rights claims, and none of it worked in the courts. A couple of times I got close and the judge would say it was not quite right. I said the right thing but I did not say it the right way. But they would not tell me what was wrong with my case.

IMMUNITY
WAIVED

The answer to the problem I was having turned out to be in the very thing that caused the problem in the first place. The answer was in the 13th and 14th Amendments, civil rights legislation. Under civil rights legislation the government has WAIVED ALL IMMUNITY. They are not immune to any civil rights claim whatsoever that is made. They have removed all legal requirements of the rules of court that apply to all lawyers in the courtroom or any court action. There is NO BASIC format that has to be followed.

They have waived the Anti-tort Claims Act pertaining to tort claims under civil rights legislation. A standard tort claim that cannot be made against the government is protected by the Anti-tort Claims Act. But a civil rights tort claim rolls right straight through. They are NOT IMMUNE.

The remedies were put there. All that was necessary was for us to learn to utilize them. But I still had the feeling that as a CITIZEN you should be entitled to this and if you were not a citizen you should not be entitled to any of this protection.

OTHERSON
v.
U.S.

I received a copy of a court case called Otherson v. US. This was where two Mexicans came across the border and were beaten up by a couple of border guards. These Mexicans got a lawyer and he put together a good civil rights suit.

OTHER
PERSON

This lawyer found out that civil rights legislation was intended by congress to cover everyone who came within the jurisdiction of the United States, NO MATTER WHO THEY ARE. He figured that out by the wording of the statute itself. It states. "Anyone who causes a DEPRIVATION OF the RIGHT of a citizen of the United States or OTHER PERSON is liable under the law. The "or other person" is what extended it BEYOND the CITIZENS of the United States. That is TITLE 42 section 1983.

I read over that back in 1983, or along about then, and I never picked up that "other person" part.

The most serious errors we have made is thinking the courts have been established by congress, or the state legislatures. And that established jurisdictions are set up by these legislatures to the extent that the courts can hear cases and that the legislatures can tell the courts what kinds of issues the courts can hear.

POLITICAL ISSUES

At no place at all, anywhere, in any of the laws of the state legislatures, or under congress, has the court EVER been given the power to hear any POLITICAL or religious issues.

The courts are not there to hear anything about the Bible or God, so do not bring either of them in.

The 16th Amendment was not properly ratified. But that is a POLITICAL issue and the court CANNOT hear a case based on that.

WRONG DEFENSE

When the fact that the 16th Amendment was not properly ratified was brought up as a DEFENSE the judge said, "Talk to your politicians about that issue."

POLITICAL ISSUES CANNOT BE USED AS A DEFENSE AND CANNOT BE BROUGHT UP IN COURT, PERIOD!!

These political issues are IRRELEVANT to the court but they ARE PROOF of the FRAUD. But since they are NOT defensive you CANNOT bring them up.

If the GOVERNMENT wanted to bring a case against a GOVERNMENT AGENT it would, then, be a CRIMINAL CHARGE against him because he did not get the LICENSE that he was required to get.

DOING BUSINESS IS NOT RELEVANT TO TAX

The fact that HE is DOING BUSINESS with YOU and he does not have a license is not a DEFENSE for you of why you did not PAY the debt that you OWE him. It is IRRELEVANT to the case. It is a POLITICAL issue because only politics can control his operation by regulations under the license, and force him to have it, or let him go on without it. It is NOT relevant to your case.

AM. JUR.

American Jurisprudence is abbreviated Am Jur. It is an encyclopedia of law like Corpus Juris. In book 16 Const 2d, under "constitutional law", in section 394 it gives a four page explanation of why congress has NEVER GIVEN POWER to the COURTS to hear POLITICAL issues.

It gives the established rule in the beginning to be beneficial to THEM, but if you use it the right way it can be beneficial to YOU.

1

COURTS CANNOT HEAR POLITICAL ISSUES

It states, "the government has NEVER given jurisdiction to the courts in any way to entertain any kind of an argument under the concept of a Republican form of government which would relate to a POLITICAL issue of how the Republican form of government was OPERATED." It says clearly you CANNOT. It goes on, "But it has been pointed out that even though the plaintiff in an action in a FEDERAL COURT for a violation of their constitutional rights might conceivably have added a CLAIM under the provisions of the federal constitution that the United States shall guarantee to

BUT
EQUAL
PROTECTION
CLAUSE

each state a Republican form of government, and such a CLAIM, BECAUSE NON-AJUDICATABLE in political nature, could not have succeeded, the plaintiff may be HEARD ANYWAY on their CLAIM of a VIOLATION of EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE of the 14th Amendment, PROVIDED that the CLAIM is not so IMMERSED in those POLITICAL QUESTION ELEMENTS which would render the CLAIM, under the guarantee clause, NON-AJUDICATABLE."

It looks like a fine line there. You CANNOT bring up such subjects as the 16th Amendment's not having been ratified. That is blatantly and clearly set forth. It is a POLITICAL question.

There is a way to get around this, using their fine line of a remedy available.

AGENTS
CAUSED
DEPRIVA-
TION OF
RIGHTS

If we say the FUNCTIONS of the agents of government, under the PRETENSE of APPROVED LAW of the 16th Amendment, may have CAUSED a DEPRIVATION of your RIGHTS by their actions, THEN we do NOT have a POLITICAL QUESTION. But we still brought the SAME ISSUE in, the 16th Amendment.

SET
CLAIM
IN COURT

If you twist the wording around the right way it will work because we said that the agent, acting under the COLOR of the LAW under the 16th Amendment, caused a DEPRIVATION of your RIGHTS and violated the EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE of the 14th Amendment. NOW YOU can set the CLAIM in the court.

BUT, understand that we CANNOT set the CLAIM into court that "The government agent did not have a right to do what he did because the 16th Amendment was never ratified." That is a POLITICAL QUESTION. It CANNOT be answered by the COURT.

FAILURE
TO STATE
CLAIM

The attempt to use POLITICAL ISSUES such as the lack of ratification of the 16th Amendment or the non-registering of foreign agents will result in the court throwing out the case by saying that there is a FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM upon which relief can be granted or that the MOTIONS ARE MERITLESS. We have heard many times from the judge that there was a FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM, or the MOTION IS WITHOUT MERIT, or that there was a FAILURE TO STATE AN OBJECTION.

The reason we FAILED using these issues was that we were trying to say that they did not do their JOBS correctly. Well, so what? What does that have to do with the fact that someone said a tax was owed? It is NOT even RELEVANT to the issue.

The court rules state that the motion, the complaint, and the answer to the complaint must be concise and direct.

Most cases are loaded with POLITICAL hogwash such as, "I do not agree with the DEBT of the United States." Or, "I object to the government putting us in debt." The court does NOT CARE about that. It is a POLITICAL issue.

WORDING
WRONG

We have been WORDING this stuff entirely the WRONG way. All of the patriot knowledge we have been getting is fabulous INFORMATION to get our minds set to the point that we understand that the government is our enemy, but NONE of it is useable in the court. That is why we have been LOSING all the cases.

MICHIGAN
CASE

WE have now WON a case after 14 years of trying. A man in Michigan was attacked by the IRS with both, CIVIL and CRIMINAL charges, at the same time. The attack started about three and one-half years ago. Within six months time they got a conviction on him and sentenced him to jail for two years. He spent two years in Federal Prison. About a year ago he got out. His name is Dan.

While he was in prison they followed up with the rest of the civil attack. The IRS put his home up for sale. It is a fifty acre piece of land in central Michigan with a house, barn, septic tank, and all the necessities, etc. It is worth a lot of money.

They sold it for \$13,600. That is how much they claimed he owed them. For just that small amount of money they put Dan in jail for two years.

Those people have no compassion. For a nickel they might kill you.

They auctioned off Dan's house.

COMMON
LAW
LIEN

Someone had a copy of a COMMON LAW LIEN that I had done on my house and they showed it to some friends of Dan. They got in touch with me and managed to get the COMMON LAW LIEN on Dan's property drawn up with some study and research on their part. They called Dan and asked if they could sign his name to it and he agreed. They went to the court and got it filed, after some stumbling around a bit.

Now there was a \$190,000 lien so we gave notice to the man who paid the auction price by calling him to see if he was aware that the lien existed. He may have been told to buy the property anyway by the IRS and that the lien did not matter. He never said much over the phone.

WRITS

A few months went by and Dan called me to let me know that the fellow that bought the land, Mr. Sap, was suing Dan. And he was trying to get a "writ of ejection" to throw Dan off the property, and a "writ of possession" to try to take the property for himself. All of this was based on the deed that the IRS gave Mr. Sap.

I told Dan that he MUST ANSWER the SUIT. Dan asked me how. I told him to remember the papers I gave him on "countercomplaint".

RULE 12
FAIL TO
ANSWER
CLAIM

According to RULE 12 of the rules of procedure, both civil and criminal, the only way to answer a "CASE" is by countercomplaint. If you FAIL to countercomplain you FAIL to RESPONSIVELY ANSWER the claim. Even the legal profession does NOT KNOW this! The LAWYERS do NOT UNDERSTAND this!

IT IS CLEAR AS A BELL IN RULE 12!!

U.C.C.

But you cannot understand RULE 12 until you understand the UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE, from which ALL the RULES of the COURT are patterned, because the courts are CONDUCTING BUSINESS and trade in the United States.

FRAUD Dan wanted to know what to use as the BASIS of the COMPLAINT. I told him that we all now know what a FRAUD this whole government SCAM is and how it operates and to go into the STATUTE OF FRAUDS in the U.C.C. and see if any of it applies here.

\$5,000 The STATUTE OF FRAUDS says that "any transaction involving
STATUTE \$5,000 or more as the VALUE of property MUST have a SIGNED
OF AGREEMENT of contract to sell. Otherwise the taking of that
FRAUDS property would constitute FRAUD."

That must mean, on the other side of the coin, that anything under \$5,000 must be a PERMISSIBLE FRAUD!!

Evidently, the LAW PERMITS FRAUD up to \$5,000, but does not permit FRAUD above that amount. That sounds crazy but that is what it appears to say. Go look it up.

So \$13,600 on this claimed deed that Mr. Sap supposedly paid is more than \$5,000 and would come under the STATUTE OF FRAUDS. Dan should do the counterclaim that Mr. Sap got the deed by FRAUD because Dan had never signed a deed to sell the property.

IRS IS Because the IRS perpetrated such a FRAUD, and Mr. Sap is a party
PARTY TO to the FRAUD, he becomes a co-conspirator in the FRAUD.
FRAUD

The lawyer for Mr. Sap answered and said that the issue we brought up would have to be faced in a Federal Court. The lawyer said that they did not disagree that Mr. Sap acquired the deed on a certain date. It was a fact that he DID acquire the deed.

We said that the deed that he DID acquire that day was a FRAUD and that Mr. Sap has no right to the property in which he acquired the deed by FRAUD.

COUNTER- So that is a countercomplaint, a complaint that Mr. Sap would not
COMPLAINT have a right to this property if it were not for a FRAUD that he,
CONSPIRACY and another that he conspired with, perpetrated upon Dan, the
owner.

Dan shot this into the court and Mr. Sap's lawyer responded by saying that Dan DID NOT DENY that Mr. Sap had the deed so the lawyer moved for a "summary judgement".

MOTION TO So we wrote a "motion to quash" the "summary judgement". The
QUASH "motion to quash" is a continuing sort of countercomplaint that says we object to the "summary judgement" but do not care what you do.

COURT Now if the "summary judgement" is granted the COURT becomes
IS A CO- ANOTHER co-conspirator in the perpetrated FRAUD and involves
CONSPIR- itself in the Federal case that we are bringing against the IRS
ATOR and ALL of the co-conspirators in this action.

JUDGE The judge RECUSED himself and they cannot find a judge to take the
RECUSED case. WHAT A WAY TO WIN!!

The COURT did not want to become involved in the FRAUD.

YOU TELL If you do not bring up the issue of FRAUD the court will let FRAUD

COURT continue. FRAUD is allowed until YOU bring it up!! YOU must bring it up, THEY cannot. The court can go by ONLY what it is TOLD.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS ARE NONSENSE The IRS and the courts have seized and sold property in the past and the owners argued all the constitutional rights and the common law rights to this issue and that issue, and how THEIR "Bill of Rights" did this and that. It was ALL NONSENSE. It was NOT RELEVANT and the judges threw the cases out of court. The arguments were dismissed and the judges ruled in favor of the ones who had the deeds.

PRESUMPTION Under the "summary disposition" RULES, if an instrument is brought in as evidence in the "CASE" it is to be PRESUMED by the court that the instrument is GOOD on its FACE.

COUNTER-COMPLAIN THEIR PRESUMPTION Now it is up to YOU to SHOW that the instrument is NOT GOOD on its FACE. If you do not do that then you have failed to RESPONSIVELY ANSWER by COUNTERCOMPLAINING their PRESUMED legitimate complaint that they have a right based on the DOCUMENT's being GOOD on its FACE.

Dan wrote it up, with a little help. He called the other day to tell me he went into court on March 2, 1993 for the hearing on the "summary disposition". When he got there they told him that the hearing was cancelled. He said he did not believe them. So Dan went to the COURT CLERK'S office and the clerk said that the hearing was cancelled. Dan said, "I am here! Why has it been cancelled?"

The CLERK said, "The JUDGE is not here."

Dan asked. "Why is the judge not here?"

The clerk said, "He recused himself. He does not want any thing to do with this case."

So Dan asked when there would be another judge to take the case and she replied, "I do not know if we will EVER get another judge to take this case!"

TRAPPED If you build a box and put them in it they cannot get out. The system and its own actors have built all of the sides of the box. All we need to do is to learn how to put the lid on it and nail it shut. We will have them TRAPPED in THEIR own SCHEME.

They CANNOT DENY these FRAUDS because we can prove them. And there is no "statute of limitations" on FRAUD. We can take it back to the beginning if necessary.

The STATUTE OF FRAUDS is in the U.C.C. in section 2-103 or 2-203 (look up)

INSTRUMENT An INSTRUMENT is a written document of any kind. A lease, bond, will, or title....etc. Remember this definition. It gets used in the U.C.C. all the time.

SIGNATURE Under LIABILITY OF PARTIES, section 3-401 of the U.C.C..... SIGNATURE is the name of that particular section and says that NO PERSON is LIABLE for an INSTRUMENT unless his SIGNATURE appears thereon.

CONTRACT An INSTRUMENT is a written CONTRACT of any kind.

An APPLICATION for a mortgage is a written DOCUMENT and is an INSTRUMENT. It is also a CONTRACT and your SIGNATURE appears thereon. You have to SIGN it when you make the APPLICATION.

An APPLICATION for SOCIAL SECURITY is a contractual form of an INSTRUMENT with your SIGNATURE on it. Now you are liable for ANYTHING connected to SOCIAL SECURITY..... like CONTRIBUTION.

CONTRIBUTION CONTRIBUTION means the forced exaction of money from any party who participates in the scheme to INSURE the debts and losses of ALL the other PARTIES who are PARTY to the SCHEME.

The INSUROR of SOCIAL SECURITY is YOU!! That is what the definition says.

Social Security was sold to the American people as being a good Christian thing to do. We all wanted to take care of the elderly. That is the way Social Security was sold to America. It must be a good thing.

F.I.C.A. But "Social Security" is not the name of the law implementing Social Security. The name of the law is the "FEDERAL INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS ACT". F.I.C.A. is what we see written on our paycheck withholding each payday. If it is such a great idea they should call it what it is, and not what they tell us it is. If we will look up each of the words in the title of the Law we will find out what it is, rather than what the government tells us it is.

Now you know what the initials mean and what CONTRIBUTION means. It is probably not what you thought it meant.

This means that the AGENCY can take any amount of money that they need to offset the debts and losses of the rest of the PARTIES to the SCHEME.

LIABLE FOR DEBT Since the United States Government is the largest PARTY to the SCHEME, you must be responsible for the debts and liabilities of the U.S. Government. And they have run up a tremendous debt. And YOUR SIGNATURE on the APPLICATION made YOU LIABLE for the DEBT that the GOVERNMENT created.

WE, you and I, OWE the national DEBT because we GUARANTEED it for them. They can spend all that they want. The American people will pay the bill, the ones that are in the SOCIAL SECURITY program.

OUR SIGNATURES MADE US LIABLE. WE DO OWE IT IF WE SIGNED FOR IT.

SIGNATURE It says that no person is liable UNLESS his SIGNATURE appears thereon. Why did they not say that if your SIGNATURE IS on the INSTRUMENT you will assume the liability? That is what it means. "No person is liable unless his signature is on there" was written to mean that when his signature IS on there he IS LIABLE.

INDORSE- MENT

Here is how his LIABILITY is ESTABLISHED to the LAW: "Unless the INSTRUMENT clearly indicates that the SIGNATURE is made in some other capacity, it is an INDORSEMENT". An INDORSEMENT is a full acceptance of EVERYTHING associated with the AGREEMENT that YOU are making.

INDORSEMENT as defined by Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Edition, under ACCOMODATION INDORSEMENT: "In the law of NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS, one made by a THIRD PERSON without any CONSIDERATION, but merely for the BENEFIT of the HOLDER of the INSTRUMENT, or to enable the MAKER to obtain MONEY or CREDIT on it."

MAKER CAN BORROW

This means that an INDORSEMENT is an ACCOMODATION which accomodates the person who made the INSTRUMENT you INDORSED. When you INDORSE APPLICATION for registration of an automobile and you give them the paper that you signed, called an "APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION", you have INDORSED the INSTRUMENT, left the INSTRUMENT in their hands, and it enables them, the MAKER, to BORROW money or credit AGAINST IT.

And that is how the government got to spend so much money. They got credit because they put YOUR PROPERTY up as COLLATERAL. In the case of Social Security YOUR BODY itself was the property that was put up as COLLATERAL.

CAR

When you signed the application for automobile registration YOUR CAR was identified as the property to be put up as COLLATERAL for the government to BORROW against.

HOUSE

When your lawyer signed the TRANSFER AFFIDAVIT at the PUBLIC RECORDS of the COURT showing the transfer of the DEED to YOUR HOUSE from somebody else to you, and filed it in their records, then he INDORSED that FOR YOU, acting as your AGENT, they used YOUR HOUSE as COLLATERAL. It was the property named on the INSTRUMENT.

BODY

When you..."dear Mom", put your INDORSEMENT SIGNATURE on the bottom of an APPLICATION for a birth certificate for your child, you turned the BODY OF THE CHILD over as property for them to borrow money against. The child was named on the INSTRUMENT.

HUMAN RESOURCES

The Office of Human Resources of the Federal and State governments deal with "human beings" as "RESOURCES." The humans are treated as resources just like oil, timber, minerals, or agriculture etc. Human beings are property to them and treated as such.

When you sign the SOCIAL SECURITY application your BODY is identified as the PROPERTY.

I had the chance to upset some poor guy in Baltimore. I sent him a bill for something which I will read later. He called me about this matter and he asked me what this was all about.

I told him that he deprived me of some of my property rights by his actions and I was billing him for the loss. He said he knew that, but told me that I made a threat down here that I would do a DISTRRAINT WARRANT and EXECUTE against all property he had.

I had listed the property and I told him I would take his house,

his car, his wife, his children, and any tools he had. He got upset about the wife and children. He said that taking them would be slavery. He said, "You cannot do that!"

HOLDER

I told him that he did not seem to understand that they already are slaves because they are property of the government. I told him that right then HE was the HOLDER.

But he had a debt to me and if I can collect on this debt then I can become the HOLDER. So I am going to end up with his wife. But my wife was against it because we would have to feed her. That ended that.

The thing to remember here is that when you INDORSE an INSTRUMENT and LEAVE it in some one else's hands and it IDENTIFIES a piece of PROPERTY, they can USE the PROPERTY and the VALUE of that PROPERTY as COLLATERAL to acquire CREDIT. THERE IS NO LAW AGAINST DOING IT.

The LAW states that you CAN do it.

ANARCHY

ONE LAW states that you CANNOT steal. THIS LAW states that you CAN steal. This leads to CONFUSION in law. CONFUSION IN LAW IS ANARCHY. What we have in this country is ANARCHY. There is NO LAW here.

HOLDER
IN DUE
COURSE

UCC 3-305 is titled the RIGHTS TO HOLDER IN DUE COURSE. "To the extent that a HOLDER is a HOLDER IN DUE COURSE, he takes the instrument, free from ALL claims to it on the part of any person." Remember that this section is called the RIGHTS OF THE HOLDER IN DUE COURSE.

When one person takes the INSTRUMENT free from all claims to it by any other person means that if I bought the property I do NOT have ANY RIGHT in the property because I do NOT even have a RIGHT to claim anything on it.

(Property is defined as the "RIGHT" to the USE of a thing, NOT THE THING ITSELF.)

If you fill out anything, such as a voter registration, that identifies YOU as a body, and leave that INSTRUMENT in the hands of the government, they become the HOLDER IN DUE COURSEe of that INSTRUMENT (not of your body itself, the instrument). They take the INSTRUMENT free from ALL CLAIMS to it on the part of any person and acquire every bit of right in the property identified thereon, YOUR BODY.

We do NOT have ANY RIGHT in this country of PROPERTY!

Thomas Jefferson made a good comment, "WITHOUT PROPERTY THERE IS NO LIBERTY!"

FREEDOM
WHEN FEE
PAID

We equate LIBERTY with FREEDOM, but that is not really an equation. FREEDOM is what we have in America. We have a lot of FREEDOM. You are FREE to drive provided you PAY the fee to get on the roads. You are FREE to work provided that you PAY the fee to

work, called income tax and social security.

You are FREE to go fishing provided that you have PAID the fee for the license. The same is true for hunting and other FREEDOMS we have in America.

LIBERTY But you are not at LIBERTY to do anything because you do not have any property. "Without property there is no liberty."

THEIR The police have told me that I could take my car home and start it up in the driveway and execute my right to travel all I want as long as I did not get off MY property and come out onto THEIR roads. Good point!

RIGHT TO On my property, in which I have a possessory interest, I have a RIGHT to TRAVEL. I can travel from one end of it to the other end of it. I cannot cross the line and go onto someone else's property. That would be TRESPASSING.

If the State has DEEDED the LAND for the ROADWAYS to ITSELF then it is the State's PRIVATE PROPERTY. I need a PERMIT called a drivers' license to use THEIR property or I would be TRESPASSING. This is another example of how we have been robbed in America.

When you identify your property on this INSTRUMENT that you are filling out, such as an application for registration of a car, and then it is signed by you and handed over to them, you have transferred the property to THEM. But YOU thought you were transferring it from the DEALER to YOU because it says that on its face.

If the State takes the paper and HOLDS on to it in the middle of the transfer between me and you, the State becomes involved in the transfer and the State ends up with the RIGHT IN THE PROPERTY!

That is called a FRAUDULENT TRANSFER!

FRAUDULENT It is covered by statutes called FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCE STATUTES. This is defined in the law dictionary as a conveyance or TRANSFER of property, the object of which is to DEFRAUD a CREDITOR or hinder him, or to delay him, or to put such property beyond his reach.

A CREDITOR is one who puts up the value for somebody else. It was YOUR car. If YOU were selling it to ME you were putting the value of your car up to transfer it to me. I am the DEBTOR. I am going to owe you for the car. The State gets in the middle of this transaction and hinders you from being able to get the full value of your car as a CREDITOR.

That is called an UNLAWFUL CONVERSION.

UNLAWFUL An UNLAWFUL CONVERSION is what occurs during an UNLAWFUL CONVEYANCE. (look these words up)

CONVERSION A CONVERSION is an UNAUTHORIZED ASSUMPTION or exercise of the RIGHT of OWNERSHIP over GOODS or personal CHATTEL belonging to ANOTHER.

What is the State doing with these INSTRUMENTS?

They are perpetrating an UNAUTHORIZED assumption or exercise of the RIGHT of ownership of these automobiles. The State is receiving the RIGHT in the property. If they are taking the RIGHT of the property, that is part of the RIGHT of the ownership, then they are exercising control over your use of the property that you think is TOTALLY yours and have the right in.

This system is all FRAUD! FRAUD EVERYWHERE.

DESIGNED

This system is DESIGNED to specifically get the VALUE of every bit of your PROPERTY away from you!

All of this can be used as evidence but it must be explained exactly what the FRAUD is. This is where we could use some help from lawyers that want to help the cause of liberty. (It may require a retired lawyer with nothing to lose to help in this.)

U.S.
vs
HERRON

There are a couple of court cases that I know of that expose the FRAUD. One is U.S. v. Herron, 825 F 2d 50 (1987).

The case is about a man who made a lot of money and took it out of the U.S. and brought it back in small quantities so that he would not have to pay income tax on the whole amount. He perpetrated a FRAUD by doing this. This case is an example of what the government calls FRAUD. It is about HIDING TRUTH.

This guy would not have had to do this if he had known about the STATUS of being a NONRESIDENT alien.

His money was made from NON-GOVERNMENT sources, from private sources, so he did not owe a tax anyway. But he did not know that.

HIDING
TRUTH IS
FRAUD

This case shows that what he did was a FRAUD because he was trying to HIDE it. HIDING the TRUTH or RIGHT of the property is FRAUD. And in order to catch him the IRS perpetrated another FRAUD themselves.

McNALLY
v.
U.S.

The second case is McNally v. U.S., 483 U.S. 350. This also shows FRAUD and explains it in detail. This case details tangible and intangible property RIGHTS along with tangible and intangible property rights FRAUDS. It shows what a FRAUD against a tangible property right would be.

These cases should be put on your reading list so that you will be able to completely explain FRAUD and then make a case that shows the FRAUD in any area that you might need to apply.

FRAUD IS EVERYWHERE and you should practice describing it.

BACK OFF

If you begin to put these cases together properly the government will BACK OFF where they would have come forward previous to this knowledge.

TRESPASS

A TRESPASS of any kind is a FRAUD upon the person or property. Any kind of a FRAUD dreamed up to be committed on a person is, in

turn, a TRESPASS. Any kind of a FRAUD or a TRESPASS turns out to be an INJURY to the person that has been TRESPASSED upon or DEFRAUDED.

INJURY

An INJURY is something that you can take into COURT and create an ACTION on. A DEPRIVATION of personal property RIGHTS is INJURY.

An INJURY is entitled to COMPENSATION! MONEY DAMAGES!

Someone may be able to make a couple of bucks before this whole FRAUDULENT system collapses. Maybe they can burn them in the fireplace when they become completely worthless.

These actions may be the PAPER ARROWS to shoot over there at Babylon to knock it down.

It is necessary to review several definitions in order to define FRAUD. One of the words is SCHEME.

SCHEME

A SCHEME is a design or a plan formed to accomplish ANY purpose at all; a SYSTEM. When used in a bad sense the word corresponds to trick or FRAUD. A SCHEME to DEFRAUD. Within the meaning of the mail FRAUD statutes, it is the intentional use of FALSE or FRAUDULENT REPRESENTATION for the purpose of gaining a valuable UNDUE advantage or working some INJURY to some thing of value held by another.

MAIL
FRAUD
STATUTES

That fits all the things that were just discussed, such as motor vehicle registration, Social Security, voter registration, birth certificates for the children, and other SCHEMES to gain a PROPERTY VALUE INTEREST in whatever PROPERTY is IDENTIFIED on the INSTRUMENT.

This whole thing sounded like a SHAM so I decided to look up that word.

SHAM

SHAM means FALSE. A TRANSACTION without SUBSTANCE, that will be DISREGARDED for TAX purposes.

CANNOT
TAX

That means that they cannot TAX something that is FRAUDULENT because FRAUD also means FALSE.

This last point by itself could be enough to free the people from an illegal tax system. Since the whole SCHEME of taxation in this country is a SHAM the law says to set it aside or DISREGARD it.

Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Cardoza, in 1944, referred to the 14th Amendment as a SCHEME of FORCED liberty. Today we are finally all equal, more than before. We ALL are PROPERTY and ALL EQUAL since we are all HELD by another, the GOVERNMENT, through CONTRACTS.

DECEIT

DECEIT is a FRAUDULENT and DECEPTIVE misrepresentation. It is an ARTIFICE or DEVICE used by one or more persons to DECEIVE or to TRICK another who is IGNORANT of the TRUE facts to the PREJUDICE and DAMAGE of the party IMPOSED upon.

We are creating a basis for an action here. By explaining how the deception and fraud took place we can then show that we have cause to be compensated for the injury that resulted from the DECEPTION

that they perpetrated.

That definition of DECEIT mentioned the word ARTIFICE.

ARTIFICE An ARTIFICE is an ingenious CONTRIVANCE or a DEVICE of some kind, and when used in a bad sense it corresponds to TRICK or FRAUD.

The instruments of the systems mentioned before, such as Social Security, voter registration, and all the rest would certainly fit into the definition of an ARTIFICE as being a DEVICE of some kind to trick or perpetrate a FRAUD because you were TRICKED into using these DEVICES. And YOU have given up your property for them to hold to the detriment or PREJUDICE of YOURSELF, the PARTY imposed upon.

These DOCUMENTS that the government calls VALID are ARTIFICES. They constitute a FRAUD.

FRAUD FRAUD is an intentional PERVERSION of the TRUTH for the purpose of inducing another in reliance upon it to part with some valuable thing belonging to him or to SURRENDER a LEGAL RIGHT.

When you FILE your DEED in the public RECORDS, the COURT, you SURRENDER the legal RIGHT to the property. By the ARTIFICE, the application, and the misrepresentation of law, you are induced into that. You had BETTER do these things or you will be arrested and put in jail if you refuse to do them. So you did them under DURESS.

ACTIONABLE FRAUD ACTIONABLE FRAUD is DECEPTION practiced in order to INDUCE another to part with property or SURRENDER some legal RIGHT. It is a FALSE representation made with the intention to DECEIVE. It may be committed by stating what is KNOWN to be FALSE or by professing knowledge of TRUTH of a statement which is FALSE. In either case an essential ingredient is the FALSEHOOD intended to DECEIVE. To constitute an ACTIONABLE FRAUD it must appear that the defendant made a material misrepresentation, that it was FALSE, that when he made it he KNEW it was FALSE, or made it RECKLESSLY WITHOUT any knowledge of its TRUTH as a positive ASSERTION, that he made it with the intention that it should be acted upon by the plaintiff, and that the plaintiff acted upon it in RELIANCE upon the TRUTH that he ANTICIPATED it had, and that the plaintiff thereby suffered an INJURY.

If you study that closely, it sets up the BASIS of your whole CASE.

INJURED Because we have been INJURED by the loss of our property by being COMPELLED by misrepresentations of law into PARTICIPATING in all of these government things that identify our property, and we lost the right of our property, we have suffered a LOSS because of their misrepresentations.

NO FORCED CONTRACTS They cannot make you contract with them by any means. NO LAW can be passed that states that you have to make a CONTRACT with them. But they are getting away with this stuff because we are afraid of them. And they are going to get away with it and you are never going to win as a DEFENDANT. The only way to win is to go after them for FRAUD.

YOU
BECOME
PLAINTIFF

If YOU are the PLAINTIFF and THEY are the DEFENDANT and you accuse them of FRAUD, and you ask for \$100,000 it is going to scare them so bad that they are not going to answer you. A FAILURE to answer a case is a WIN.

The court has backed off the case in Michigan for now. They are not going to play with this thing. They are afraid. In that case Mr. Sap cannot get the court to sign an order for possession. He is going to lose his \$13,600 that he paid the IRS for the property since he cannot take possession of it. He is going to have to sue the IRS to get his money back. He is definitely not happy about that.

INJURY

An INJURY is ANY WRONG or DAMAGE done to another in his PERSON, his RIGHTS, his REPUTATION, or his PROPERTY. If you have received any kind of an INJURY then you have the right to file for a COMPENSATION in a court ACTION, even against the GOVERNMENT.

U.S.
v.
TWEEL

SILENCE
IS FRAUD

A refusal to answer something is SILENCE. In the court case of U.S. v. Tweel, 550 F 2d 297 (1977), the judge said, "SILENCE can ONLY be equated with FRAUD where there is a LEGAL or MORAL DUTY to SPEAK, or when an inquiry left UNANSWERED would be intentionally misleading. We CANNOT condone this shocking CONDUCT by the IRS. Our revenue system is based on the "good faith" of the taxpayers (government workers) and the taxpayers should be able to expect the SAME "good faith" from the government in its enforcement and collection activities."

"GOOD
FAITH"

"During the oral arguments counsel for the government stated that these practices of SILENCE were ROUTINE. If that is the case we hope our message is clear! This sort of DECEPTION will NOT be tolerated, and if this is ROUTINE it should be corrected immediately!"

We just learned that FRAUD is actionable and we could create a case with FRAUD as the basis.

SILENCE
IS
ACTIONABLE

SILENCE by an official or police, or anyone else that will not answer your question, results only in an attempt to DEFRAUD you by some SCHEME to DEFRAUD and is, itself, grounds for an action just as FRAUD is actionable.

SECURITY
INSTRU-
MENTS

There is another case that lines itself right up with the Erie Railroad decision, but it also includes some real interesting comments about the situation that the government put itself in by dealing in these SECURITY INSTRUMENTS, such as deeds, certificates of title, and insurance policies, like Social Security. Those INSTRUMENTS are called SECURITY INSTRUMENTS.

The fact that the property is identified on there SECURES the property INTEREST that is IDENTIFIED to the name of the party appearing thereon. That is why they are called SECURITY INTERESTS.

CLEARFIELD
GOV'T.

The Clearfield Doctrine, refers to the Clearfield Trust Company v. U.S. 318 US 363 (1943), expressed, "The government descends to the level of a mere CORPORATION and takes on the CHARACTER of a

DESCENDS TO CITIZEN PRIVATE CITIZEN where private, corporate, commercial paper SECURITIES are concerned."

NO IMMUNITY That means they DO NOT have any IMMUNITY. They are EQUAL to ME and YOU. They are right on a level with us.

NAME ON INSTRUMENT If OUR name appears on the security INSTRUMENT and THEIR name appears on the security INSTRUMENT they are the SAME as US. They have NO MORE RIGHTS than we do. We have NO FEWER RIGHTS than the government does!

Most people think that the government is superior. This case states that the government is EQUAL.

(note: Falsely ELEVATING the government to OUR level is really stretching it.)

CLEARFIELD DOCTRINE Quoting Clearfield again, "For purposes of suit, such CORPORATIONS and INDIVIDUALS are regarded as an ENTITY entirely SEPARATE from government." Very interesting case.

Now we can understand why the civil rights legislation waived all IMMUNITY for government agents. The only way that they are committing a DEPRIVATION of your RIGHTS is by WRITTEN INSTRUMENTS.

Everything they do to you is based on some written INSTRUMENT. EVERYTHING!

COURT MUST HAVE CONTRACT FIRST The court CANNOT acquire JURISDICTION over a case unless there is a written INSTRUMENT involved of some type or another. There has to be a contract, the agreement, or the ASSUMPTION of a contract or agreement, such as RESIDENCY.

RESIDENCY RESIDENCY is a CONDUCT. And they always have to establish RESIDENCY in order to prove to the court that it has JURISDICTION over the ISSUE and the PERSON in front of it.

A man in Tennessee would not admit that he was a resident of Tennessee and the judge got so frustrated that he even asked the man where he slept in order to establish RESIDENCY. The judge was trying to get him to admit that he slept in Tennessee to establish RESIDENCY. Finally, the judge threw him out of the court. He could not establish RESIDENCY. When he could not establish RESIDENCY he could NOT PROVE JURISDICTION over the man.

CIVIL RIGHTS CASE You can put together a good civil rights case showing and exposing how the FRAUD created the INJURY. You can show that they are equal to you without their having special or particular immunities BECAUSE there is commercial paper involved.

The commercial paper involved consists of Social Security applications, IRS 1040 forms, vehicle registration applications, and other license applications and various other forms used by all governments and at all levels.

HAVE NO IMMUNITY These government entities, such as the IRS, are all equal to you and have NO particular IMMUNITIES. By their SILENCE they have proven their involvement in SCHEMES to DEFRAUD you. This action, according to the Supreme Court, CANNOT be tolerated by the courts.

Triple damages may be in order here. A tax bill tripled could be awarded. The courts would not argue with it. The courts know racketeering when they see it. RICO may apply.

26 USC
SEC 6323

U.C.C. IN
TITLE 26

Look at how this FRAUD works and fits into some of the law. There is a statute called the Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966. It has been CODIFIED in Title 26, sec. 6323. In USCS, United States Code Services, under section 6323 N 5, there was found to state, "The purpose of The Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966, which is codified 26 USC, sec 6323, was to FIT tax LIENS into the priority SCHEME of the UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE." This came right out of the book of laws, USCS.

This is not someone's opinion. It is in the statutes, the codes.

U.C.C IN
IRS CODE

For all of those that think that the UCC does not fit into the IRS Code and cannot be used simultaneously with it.... that is what the CODE states!! Title 26 is the IRS CODE.

READ IT AGAIN.

"THE FEDERAL TAX LIEN ACT WAS CREATED TO FIT TAX LIENS INTO THE PRIORITY SCHEME OF THE UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE."

26 USC
SEC 6323

TRANSFER
PROPERTY

Continuing from USCS 6323, "The purpose of requiring of filing of a Notice of Federal Tax Lien was NOT to create the lien, but only to MAINTAIN its PRIORITY over certain other liens. The fair intendment of the predecessor of 26 USC sec 6323 is to permit the transfer of property, both real and personal, belonging to the person who has neglected to, or failed to, pay the tax without a REAL LIEN of government attaching the property."

People have been saying for years that a NOTICE of TAX LIEN is not worth the paper it is written on.

SELF-
ABNEGATION

CLASSES OF
PERSONS

Continuing the quote, "Predecessor to 26 USC sec 6323 was an act of self-abnegation UPON the part of the GOVERNMENT in the collection of the taxes by which it MUST abide. There is no question of strict versus loose CONSTRUCTION that arises. There is no room for CONSTRUCTION as predecessor to 6323 as classes of persons was specific."

(Abnegation is the act of denial. To abnegate means to "deny or refuse a RIGHT." It is from the Latin word, "abnegatus", which means to deny or to refuse.)

That means it is set in stone and CANNOT be changed by CONSTRUCTION as to the CLASS of PERSON that a FEDERAL TAX LIEN can be laid against.

26 USC
SEC 6331

NOTICE
AND DEMAND

Cross reference, see sec 6331, titled, "Levy and Distraint": "Authority of the secretary: If any person liable to pay any tax neglects or refuses to pay the same within ten days after a NOTICE AND DEMAND, (from UCC, used again by IRS code) it shall be lawful for the secretary to collect such tax and such further sum as shall be sufficient to cover the expenses of the levy by levy upon the property and rights to property except such property as is exempt under 6334, belonging to such person (the one who refused to pay his tax),.... is a lien provided by this chapter for the payment of such tax, levy may be made upon the accrued salary or

LEVY FOR
GOV'T
EMPLOYEES
ONLY

wages or properties of any officer, employee, or elected official of the United States, the District of Columbia. or any AGENCY or INSTRUMENTALITY of the GOVERNMENT of the United States or the District of Columbia."

The "State of Georgia" or any other named State is an INSTRUMENTALITY of the United States.

"State of (any state name)" is the government CORPORATION of that state.

"Georgia" IS NOT! The "State of Georgia" IS the government of Georgia and is an INSTRUMENTALITY of the United States Government.

Any named "County of" government is an instrumentality of the "State of" government which is an instrumentality of the "United States" Government. That shows the connection of the local governments with the Federal Government since they are all agencies of the one above them.

If you work for any phase of government whatsoever you are covered by the connection of the agencies to the Federal Government. You are covered by that statement above and there is a period behind that statement as was stated as to whom it applies. It does not go on to name anyone else as to whom it applies.

The statement is very specific, TAX LIENS CAN ONLY BE LAID UPON GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AND GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS! NOT YOU AND ME!

ARGUE THE
FRAUD

That was part of the argument used in Dan's case to show the rest of the FRAUD. And that was what prompted the lawyer to say that all the stuff you brought up about section 6331 is an argument that belongs in a FEDERAL COURT. We knew he was going to say that, because it DOES belong in a FEDERAL COURT. It did not belong in that little court. It was not relevant to the case of a guy having a deed and wanting a "writ of possession" based on the deed he got. Section 6331 is not relevant to that case!

BUT it IS part of the COUNTERCOMPLAINT to show that he got the deed by FRAUD and the "set-up" was to say, "Fine. We're going to have a Federal case and this guy, Mr. Sap, is a CO-CONSPIRATOR in the FRAUD and we certainly hope that the COURT does not intend to become another CO-CONSPIRATOR of the FRAUD with the IRS."

WHEN THE LID IS PUT ON THAT BOX THERE IS NO WAY OUT!

LAY OUT
THE CASES

There are two ways to lay these cases out. One way is the COUNTER-COMPLAINT.

All places where there is a COMPLAINT filed MUST be answered by a COUNTERCOMPLAINT.

RULE 12

RULE 12 of the FEDERAL RULES of CIVIL PROCEDURE is the one that these cases are based on. The State rules state the same words as the Federal Rules but the number of the rule may not be 12. It may

be 5 or 10 or another number. It may also be rule 12 as in the Federal rules. You have to check the rules out for each state.

They are UNIFORM throughout the STATES, they use basically the same wording.

RULE 12 states that you must see RULE 13. These Rules run you all around.

RULE 12 states, "FOR THE RESPONSIVE OBJECTIONS SEE RULE 13."

RULE 13 RULE 13 is headed: "MANDATORY COUNTERCOMPLAINTS."

COUNTER- Since it is MANDATORY then that is what expresses the meaning that
COMPLAINT the RESPONSE has to be done in the form of a COUNTERCOMPLAINT,
MANDATORY otherwise it DOES NOT ANSWER THE COMPLAINT. It is absolutely
MANDATORY that you FILE a COUNTERCOMPLAINT!

It goes on to explain that the COUNTERCOMPLAINT has to be filed PRIOR to the FINAL judgement. After judgement the COUNTERCOMPLAINT is barred.

We cannot bring any old cases back by countercomplaint. That chance has passed.

WHEN YOU DO NOT COUNTERCOMPLAIN YOU DO NOT ANSWER THE COMPLAINT.

RULE 13 shows how to lay out the case. It cross references back to RULE 8.

RULE 8c. RULE 8c is titled, "AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES."

An AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE seems to be a contradiction of words.

An example of the difference between an AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE and a common law defense can be illustrated by my being accused of stealing a bicycle.

COMMON The common law defense would be for me to state, "No. I did not
LAW steal your bicycle." That would be my answer, my DEFENSE. That in
DEFENSE common law.

Now I have thrown the burden back on the plaintiff to prove that I stole the bicycle. In common law the accused is always INNOCENT until PROVEN guilty.

If I failed to answer, the SILENCE would have been an ADMISSION of guilt, or FRAUD, or such acts. It would not have had to go any further.

MODERN It does not work that way in MODERN law. In modern law the rule is
LAW USES PRESUMPTION. The court MUST PRESUME the facts of the COMPLAINT
PRESUMPTION presented are CORRECT until the defendant presents evidence to
REBUT the PRESUMPTION.

COMMON LAW MUST HAVE GONE SOMEWHERE!

In the case here the defendant has to prove his innocence. So he is GUILTY UNTIL PROVEN INNOCENT! That is the same way the system works. BACKWARDS.

AFFIRMA-
TIVE
DEFENSE

That is why they put in AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE. So that you could admit that you were guilty. Then you defend yourself by saying, "Yes I stole his bicycle. But he parked it in front of my house and left it there for six months. I thought he abandoned it. So it is his fault that I took the bicycle, because he left it there for me to take."

That is AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE. I am not guilty. I created rebuttable evidence.

MUST TELL
THE COURT

THE COURT DOES NOT KNOW UNTIL YOU TELL THEM. That is why you must affirmatively answer. They do not know that the other party is negligent, that HE perpetrated a FRAUD. They do not know that the other party contrived or created a DEVICE or an ARTIFICE to get you involved in something like this.

This fits exactly to show how you can be induced into these SCHEMES or SHAMS, and your property has been stolen, and you become liable because you did not use your property correctly. Once they are the HOLDER and they put it up as collateral they must make sure you maintain it so that the VALUE of the collateral does not DROP. They might have to PAY back the borrowed money.

PERMITS

So they make laws regulating how you take care of your property. That is what automobile laws are all about. That is what building permit laws are all about. They want to make sure your property is well maintained so the collateral VALUE remains HIGH so they do not have to pay off the debt for the money that they BORROWED against it.

I do not like the fact that they have taken unfair advantage of me and I am mad at myself for letting them get away with it. I let them do it. Now I am in the defensive mode.

The government's claim is that I did not abide by the things that I agreed to do. I did not even know that I agreed to do most of these things.

Look at the front of a CERTIFICATE OF TITLE. It states, "The above named person is the owner of the vehicle described hereon and agrees to operate this vehicle in accordance with the laws of the State of Georgia." They tricked me into agreeing to go along with their laws. Now they will take me into court because I did not do what I agreed to do. Not because I did something wrong, but because I did not do what I agreed to do.

THEY HAVE
OBLIGATION
TO TELL

But I only agreed to do it because you did not tell me what kind of a SCAM you were getting me into. And under the law they have a "good faith" obligation requirement to tell you about such SCAMS. That they are using YOUR property to borrow money against it and that you are going to have to keep that property maintained under their rules so that the value of the property is kept up. They did not tell me about all of this. If they had told me about all of this I would definitely not have done it.

26 USC 911 According to Title 26 USC, the IRS tax collection laws, section 911, the corresponding CFR cite is 1.991, under the heading
CFR 1.911 CITIZENS AND RESIDENTS WITH FOREIGN EARNED INCOME.

We know that the United States is a foreign corporation with respect to a state (small "s") because the state is a foreign corporation to the United States. See again, N.Y. re. Merriam, 16 S.Ct. 1073, that held the U.S. is a FOREIGN CORPORATION with respect to a state (small "s").

N.Y. re.
MERRIAM

Enright v. U.S. shows that the Federal Government is a "state".

"STATE OF" If I live in the (s)tate and not the "State of", because I am not a member of the State Government, then I am FOREIGN to the "United States" and the "State of" due to the fact that the "State of" is NOT FOREIGN to the "United States". The State Government is NOT FOREIGN to the "United States" Government since it is an INSTRUMENTALITY of it. This was the result of the 14th Amendment in 1868.

Only the (s)tate is FOREIGN to the "United States" and that is the people that live in the vast countries known as Georgia, Arkansas, Florida, Texas and the rest of the fifty states, not "State of".

The people ARE the (s)tate. The governments are the "State of", the corporate entities, the CORPORATE BODY POLITIC.

JURIS- We found a case in Maryland that stated it was dismissed for want of JURISDICTION. A way to find out how they have JURISDICTION is to look at why they did not have it. Look at it from the other side of the coin. The case was about a man who sued the "State of Maryland" Board of Education, in Carroll County. It was dismissed from Carroll County Circuit Court, For the State of Maryland, for want of JURISDICTION.

DICTION

This was the State of Maryland Circuit Court. This would mean that you could not file a case in the circuit court against the State of Maryland. We did not understand. So we looked up the cross reference case. And it was about another man who brought a case against the Board of Education of the State of Maryland in the Baltimore City Circuit Court for the State of Maryland. It was dismissed for want of JURISDICTION.

We were getting the idea that either you cannot sue the "State of Maryland" or you cannot sue the Board of Education. Why were these cases being dismissed for want of jurisdiction? Why were the cases being dismissed when the people were suing the State?

We found another cross reference to a case that stated, "See this case for establishment of JURISDICTION of suits against the State of Maryland." It stated that, "All suits against the State of Maryland must be filed in the Anne Arundel County Circuit Court for the State of Maryland."

THAT WAS IT!

Annapolis is the capitol of Maryland and is located in Anne

MUST SUE
WHERE
LOCATED

Arundel County and the CORPORATION known as the "State of Maryland" has its headquarters there. You MUST sue in the JURISDICTION where the party is located. The "State of Maryland" is located in Annapolis.

The "State of Maryland" is NOT located IN Maryland, it is NOT Maryland, it does not comprise ALL of Maryland, but it IS a CORPORATION in a building in Annapolis, in Anne Arundel County.

STATE IS
JUST AN
OFFICE

The State of Maryland is not a piece of land comprised within the boundary lines, known as "state lines", as noted in the (s)tate constitution (That is Maryland state.). It is nothing more than an OFFICE for the corporation's headquarters, located in Annapolis.

This is true for all the fifty (s)tates, not just Maryland. The "State of" comprises only that corporate entity located in an office in the respective capitol cities of each of the (s)tates. It is just an address and only an address for an office.

HAFER
v.
MELLO

One point to remember is that when filing a suit against a government official the suit must be filed where the official is located. And in the case of Hafer v. Mello the US Supreme Court decided that Mello and his fellow employees "had an absolute right to sue Mrs. Hafer for firing them from their jobs. SHE had no governmental immunity whatsoever, only because they sued her in her personal capacity."

DIFFERENCE
WAS HOW
CASE FILED

Had they not sued her in her PERSONAL capacity she could have claimed immunity in her POLITICAL capacity. The court explains clearly that it was not a matter of what capacity she was operating in when she did the act that she was being sued for, but the DIFFERENCE was the MANNER in which the case was FILED.

NO
IMMUNITY

IT WAS FILED IN HER PERSONAL CAPACITY and she had no immunity because of that wording.

Do not sue them in their political capacity, but sue them in the jurisdiction where they did the act.

COUNTER-
CLAIMS

Some of these cases involving NON-RESIDENT ALIENS are going to require COUNTERCLAIMS against these governmental people in their personal capacities. The reason is that everyone in the government has the same silly beliefs that we all have had for all these years that we are ALL CITIZENS. And they think that they are doing the right thing by trying to collect the tax and other fees from all of us and themselves.

RESIDENCE
IN GOV'T

If you are a doctor, dentist, electrician, contractor, nurse, or anyone with a license, you promised to obey the rules to get that license from the government. You signed your name on the document and made yourself a party to the government. You became RESIDENT within the government because now your signature is on a document that is in their files. So COLORABLY you are now within the government. Now you are NOT a NON-RESIDENT ALIEN. You are RESIDENT.

But the source of income is what determines whether or not a tax is due. It is not always determined by your status.

STATUS
AND
SOURCE

A non-resident alien has both, his status and the source of income, to show that there is no tax due on the money earned. It is not so much that income was made as it is whether or not it was made from sources WITHIN or WITHOUT the "United States", the government.

FOREIGN
INCOME

Likewise, foreign earned income from a state or other people that are in that state, that are foreign to the United States, would be from a private source foreign to the government. It is not taxable for residents or for non-residents of the government, even though you may have a license to work which would ordinarily make you taxable. You have to pay taxes only on money earned from WITHIN the government.

WORK
FOR ME

If you worked for me and got paid for it by me you would NOT have a taxable income. If you built an addition to a military base and got PAID by the GOVERNMENT for it you WOULD have a taxable income.

1040 FORM
2555 FORM

So you would fill out a 1040 form showing the taxable income on the 1040 form and, according to section 1.911 CFR, explaining section 911 of IR CODE, it states that you fill out a 2555 form which shows the gross income, the total income that you had, and breaks down each source. It allows you to give the explanation for why the total amount on the 1040 form equals the amount that was from sources WITHIN the government, and that part was the only part that was taxable, and that is why that little bit is all that is shown on the 1040 form.

There is an exclusion amount there. They allow you to deduct only \$70,000 a year in private source income. Anything over and above that they figured that you made that due to your priveledge that you got for having the license, and they ask you for a tax on that amount over \$70,000.

There are not that many licensed people that have income from PRIVATE sources that would be greater than \$70,000 a year. There are some, but not that many. Most people would be exempt from taxes on their non-government income up to the \$70,000.

COUNTER

You must be ready to prove all of these points that we have mentioned so that if they come down on you then you can COUNTER them.

The IRS filed a SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT for a man in Delaware to come in and show records and handwriting examples. So we went in and showed the records and gave the handwriting examples. The records indicated the W-2 forms he had from the corporation he worked for.

NOT AN OFFICER OF CORPORATION We explained that he was not an OFFICER of the corporation that he worked for, that he was a worker, and his income was NOT EFFECTIVELY CONNECTED to the United States. The officers of the corporation may be, but he was NOT an officer. But this IS the amount of INCOME. We did not try to hide that.

The IRS said that they would be in touch.

SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT We went to the U.S. DISTRICT COURT and filed a SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT for the IRS to produce evidence that this man's income was EFFECTIVELY CONNECTED to a trade or business WITHIN the United States.

THEY ASKED WE ASKED We used the very SAME document that they used, a SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT. They asked for BOOKS and RECORDS. So we asked for BOOKS and RECORDS that SHOW the money earned is from a source WITHIN the United States.

PROVE If the IRS cannot PROVE this, they will NOT be able to PROCEED in the criminal case!

THAT IS CALLED COUNTERING THEM. This is just like a chess game.

COUNTER-COMPLAINT When you COUNTER a COMPLAINT made in court the PROSECUTOR that would originally come against you becomes your attorney in the COUNTERCOMPLAINT. The countercomplaint MUST be ruled on FIRST.

IF IT WINS THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT GOES AWAY!!

IF THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINING PARTY DOES NOT ANSWER OR SHOW UP IN COURT THE CASE CAN BE DISMISSED for "failure to prosecute in a timely manner."

CRIMINAL COMPLAINT FORM When addressing any criminal matter such as "disturbing the peace", if you are charged, the rules state that ALL criminal cases MUST originate in the LOWEST level court. So you go to the lowest level court and ASK them for a FORM for a CRIMINAL COMPLAINT.

DISMISSED Then check in the CRIMINAL CODE STATUTES for your STATE and look up what kind of law they broke. Then charge them. If they fail to show up the case will be DISMISSED with a MOTION based on a failure to prosecute timely.

McLAUGHLIN There is a civil rights decision, County of Riverside v. McLaughlin 111 S Ct Rep 1661 (1991), the Supreme Court narrowed down the 4th Amendment meaning of a RIGHT to a PROBABLE CAUSE HEARING so that you are safe in you houses and effects and property and papers. They noted that you could be arrested and held on a claim of some kind for NOT MORE THAN 48 HOURS unless there was proof of PROBABLE CAUSE.

48 HOURS You must also be arraigned properly and given the right to a lawyer which matches what was held in the Miranda decision. So

they combined Miranda and said you have to be arraigned in 48 HOURS.

If they are going to do that then WE should be able to DEMAND a PROBABLE CAUSE HEARING.

Another man in Delaware got locked up for driving without a license. He demanded a PROBABLE CAUSE HEARING when he was arrested. They refused. He demanded it again in jail and put it in writing and gave it to them. They continued to ignore him.

BUT HE WOULD NOT SIGN THE BAIL RELEASE. (very important)

We were getting ready then, to put together our first civil rights case using the McLAUGHLIN case when the Justice of the Peace decided what he would do is send him from the lower court, the J.P. Court, to the next higher court.

He appeared the next day in front of the higher court, the Court of Common Pleas, in Delaware. The judge called the case. He said, "Are you Mr. Keating?" He said, "Yes."

The judge then asked, "Do you understand the charges against you?" Mr. Keating replied, "We are not here to talk about the charges against me." The judge said, "Oh, yes we are."

THEY MUST
HAVE
JURIS-
DICTION
AGREEMENT

Mr. Keating said, "No sir, we are not. If you will check the records in your file, you will find that I did NOT ASK TO COME HERE. I have SIGNED no WAIVER of my RIGHT to be heard in the Justice of the Peace Court. And I have signed no REQUEST to come to the COMMON PLEAS COURT. This court DOES NOT yet have JURISDICTION. The Justice of the Peace sent it over here, but I did not ask to come over here or sign anything to agree to come over here to THIS COURT."

The judge looked through his file and could not find anything that would be a request or agreement to come to his court and said, "You are right. This court does NOT have JURISDICTION. This case is remanded back to the Justice of the Peace."

The Justice of the Peace could not get him to sign the CONSENT paper at his court, so he sent him to the higher court. He was hoping that the higher court judge could COERCE him into signing his consent.

FRAUD
IN
TRAFFIC
ISSUES

The case went back to the J.P. Court and has this PROBABLE CAUSE DEMAND still there. The PROBABLE CAUSE DEMAND stated that Mr. Keating wanted the PLAINTIFF brought in according to this written DEMAND. And further it stated that the COMPLAINING party must appear at the PROBABLE CAUSE HEARING to show cause that this COMPLAINT is not based on the FRAUD, misrepresentation, and COERCION emanating from the UNLAWFUL CONVERSION of the collected TAXES from the PEOPLE at large and using that tax revenue to purchase the land, construct roads thereon, and then deeding the said land to the CORPORATE State Government of Delaware, which results in a profit or a benefit to the corporate State by deeming it a priveledge to USE that property.

The J.P. was so mad and frustrated that he was throwing books and screaming. He put on a scene and threatened Mr. Keating that he

would never get out of jail if he did not sign this bail release. He said, "If you do not sign this today I am going to make the bail \$1,000,000. You will never be able to get out of this jail!"

Mr.K said, "I do not give a damn if you make it a billion dollars. I am not going to WAIVE my RIGHT to the COUNTERCOMPLAINT and I am not going to CONSENT to your FRAUD and COERCION!"

The J.P. said, "Take that man out of here! I am going to write an order that you will show up in the Court of Common Pleas on the 12th of next month. Release him!"

Now, what good will that do? The C.C.P. already knows it does not have jurisdiction, it said so. He was so frustrated that he could not get this man's CONSENT.

MUST
SIGN IN

THERE IS NO JURISDICTION IN ANY COURTS UNLESS YOU SIGN IN !!!

A CIVIL complaint has to be SIGNED by YOU in order to get the complaint going. That is how you CREATE jurisdiction for the court, by SIGNING the COMPLAINT.

In a CRIMINAL complaint, such as a traffic ticket, the cop signs the complaint, but you sign your consent. And if you do not sign in your CONSENT they CANNOT put you on trial.

RULE 19

HERE is the RULE in Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, RULE 19. (You must watch how it is hidden in the words.) RULE 19 states, "In a district consisting of two or more divisions the arraignment may be had, the plea entered, trial conducted, and sentenced imposed IF the DEFENDANT CONSENTS in ANY division at ANY time."

Then it states that RULE 19 was abrogated, not repealed, effective July 1, 1966 because of the 1966 amendment to RULE 18 eliminating "division venue of". That will change the whole perception of what is actually stated here.

MOST
IMPORTANT
PART
HERE

We will read RULE 19 again. BUT this time we will do what the ammendment states and eliminate "division venue" as it was originally mentioned in RULE 19. We will then start reading at, "....the arraignment may be had, the plea entered, trial conducted and sentence imposed if the defendant consents....."

Read it again:

"THE ARRAIGNMENT MAY BE HAD, THE PLEA ENTERED, TRIAL CONDUCTED, AND SENTENCE IMPOSED IF THE DEFENDANT CONSENTS!!"

IF THE DEFENDANT CONSENTS?.....THEN DO NOT CONSENT!...DO NOT SIGN!

DO NOT
SIGN IN

If you do not sign they will threaten you with anything in order to do so. They will tell you that you will never get out of jail. A good response to that is, "I just hope the food is good. I needed some rest anyway."

That backs them off.

Another guy had already been arrested and put in jail for criminal charges by the IRS of "willful failure to file" that were filed in District Court and he had signed the document known as "Order

Setting Conditions of Release", which is what he had to sign in order to be let out on bail. He signed it.

AGREE TO
BAIL MEANS
AGREE TO
SENTENCE

Here is what he agreed to: "Acknowledgement of the defendant. I acknowledge that I am the defendant in this case, that I am aware of the conditions of release. I promise to obey all conditions of release, to appear as directed, to surrender for service of any sentence imposed, and I am aware of the penalties and sanctions for the above. I agree to appear for the SENTENCE imposed."

Why bother with bail? Why bother with the trial? If anyone would sign this they should just tell them to go ahead and put me away and when the sentence runs out you can let me go! Trials are expensive and so are lawyers. The best thing to do would be to skip the expense and go to jail! There is no need to pay a lawyer!

That is a "standard" form. If you sign to get out on bail you will sign this form. If any of you have been to jail and got out on bail, you signed this form.

CONSENT

That is how you CONSENT.....by SIGNATURE.

So we were refusing to sign.

This guy in Pennsylvania said that he wished he had heard about this a couple of weeks ago because he had just gotten back home. They had arrested him and he had signed the paper for his release and he wanted to know what he could do about it now.

REVOCATION
OF SIGNA-
TURE

There is a section in the UCC that addresses REVOCATION OF SIGNATURE ON DOCUMENTS when you feel that the signature was coerced out of you, or by some FRAUD or intimidation you were prompted to make a signature that you would not have normally made on your own, that gives you the right under law to REVOKE your signature.

This fellow, named Reese, looked it up and used it and revoked his signature on the bail release document. Now he was worried that they may come throw him in jail because his signature was removed from the agreement and they may want to take him back to jail until the trial. But that never happened.

So he showed up at the trial and the judge called the case to begin trial and the guy told the judge that he could NOT START the case. The judge asked why and Reese told him that he had revoked his signature on the order setting conditions for release.

The judge turned to the United States Attorney and ordered him to come back in ten days and show PROOF that he had jurisdiction over this man.

The U.S. Attorney came back in with a crying plea of OBJECTION under RULE 12. She filed a COUNTERCOMPLAINT against the judge's order Not against our man. He had not done anything. It was filed against the judge's order. She complained that the jurisdiction had been established by TITLE 26, section 7401.

NEED
CONSENT

That was not true. But we missed the fact that, at that point, we should have countered her counter. Because in addition to TITLE 26 she would need his CONSENT. But we forgot to do that. So the judge

ALSO let it go by and ordered the trial would start.

They arrested him the day before the trial and made sure that he was in the court for trial the next morning. They took him to court in handcuffs, but when they got him in there they took the handcuffs off.

They picked the jury, and got the trial started. The U.S. Attorney got up and gave the opening argument to the jury and the judge asked Reese if he had any opening argument to the jury. He answered by saying that he was not going to have anything to say to the jury or anybody else until THEY can prove THEY had JURISDICTION.

He told the judge that he did not have his SIGNED CONSENT and when they come up with a consent form that he signed, that is not revoked, he might participate in THEIR trial. In the meantime, they had not established that they had JURISDICTION.

The judge said, "I know that. We will answer that question a little later on. Are you going to talk to the jury or not?"

Reese replied, "No. I am not talking to anyone."

The trial continued and the witnesses were called and one witness told the court that Reese had an income. But the witness did not put in any evidence as to the SOURCE.

PRODUCE
SOURCE

If a trial is necessary be sure to require them to produce evidence as to the SOURCE. If they do not proceed with the trial keep on questioning if they have any evidence to prove JURISDICTION over the person. He did that.

The judge said, "There is no jurisdiction established yet over you. Ask him a question about the testimony."

Reese said, "No, If you have not established JURISDICTION over me, I am not asking any questions."

The trial continued and another witness was called and then it was time to go home for all but him. He was to go back to jail. And the judge told him that he would probably rather be home in bed instead of going back to jail and said, "If you will tell me that you will agree to show up here in the morning, I will order them to let you go home tonight."

Reese thought about it a long time and said, "Yeah. I will be here tomorrow."

At that point the court clerk said, "I GOT IT! It is on the RECORD."

Then Reese realized what he had done. HE JUST CONSENTED! When he agreed verbally it was as good as his signature on a piece of paper to come into the court the next day.

Reese then demanded a ten minute recess and, with reluctance, the judge gave it to him, on the third request. Then Reese went to the back of the room and with the help of some of his friends he wrote up a REVOCATION of his VERBAL consent. The longer he sat and

thought about how the judge had tricked him the madder he became.
He went back to the bench and said to call the court back and the judge did so.

REVOKED
VERBAL
CONSENT

As soon as the judge said that the court was back in session Reese walked up to the bench and slammed the paper down in front of the judge and said, "Here is a revocation of my verbal consent that you just tricked and coerced me into and I am not putting up with any more of this nonsense! I AM LEAVING!"

He walked out of the courtroom.

RIGHT NOT
TO
PARTICI-
PATE

The judge choked and sipped water, and choked again, and was not sure what to do. After several minutes he turned to the jury and said, "This is a little bit unusual. And I am sure you do not realize what you have just witnessed. But, you see, he had a right not to participate in this trial. Tonight we are at recess and we will notify you later as to what time we will continue this trial tomorrow."

They proceeded the next day WITHOUT him and got a CONVICTION. They called him in for sentencing and he did not show up, so they sentenced him without his being there. They wrote him and asked him to come in for sentencing.

He wrote back and said that he did not want anything to do with the trial and he did not want to take part in their sentencing either. The U.S. Marshals came out and got him. They took him to Federal Prison in Pennsylvania.

ORDER OF
COMMIT-
MENT

Then Reese subpoenaed the judge for an ORDER of COMMITMENT. There was not one. So he warned the Marshals. He told them that they would be liable since they were HOLDING him WITHOUT an ORDER. But they claimed that they were not liable. He told them that he would get them and that they better go get their lawyers.

They asked him if he had any health problems that they should know about. He told them he had a wooden leg and that he ate nothing but Kosher food and fresh fruits and vegetables. So they brought him the foods he requested and had to replace his worn out leg.

They are holding Reese without an order. He should bring up a civil rights issue. This could develop into something big. We will see.

DEPRIV-
ATION
DISCRIM-
INATION

If they try to keep us from filing these countercomplaints, that amounts to an action by them causing a DEPRIVATION of our RIGHT to utilize the court. This would be DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ALIENS. Only a government flunkie can file a criminal complaint. That means that a non-governmental person is being discriminated against.

ALIENS

Back in the 1980's I found that ALIENS had more RIGHTS than

HAVE MORE RIGHTS CITIZENS did. At that time I thought I was a citizen and wondered how these ALIENS could have all these RIGHTS!

In a book about Equal Protection Laws of the 14th Amendment, Civil Rights Claims, there is a section called "DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ALIENS". It is loaded with court case cites on ALIENS in battles with the government and how the government abuses their rights.

PERSONHOOD In the same book there is a section called Rights of Privacy and Personhood. To be a "person" is to be a government official, or a "person" could be a corporation, or a "person" could be a NATURAL PERSON. A government lawyer will take the presumption that when you admit to being a "person" that you mean a "person" in government. That is advantageous to them so that they can prosecute you.

NATURAL
PERSON

You MUST clarify that you are a "person" not connected to government. Then you are the "other person" in the law and are entitled to "personhood" with a "life plane" or "life style" in this country.

SHAPIRO Then in the same book under the subect of TRAVEL there is a court
v. case here that says concurring in Shapiro v. Thompson, 394 US 618,
THOMPSON Justice Stuart described the right to travel as, "...not a mere
condition of liberty, subject to regulation and control under
RIGHT TO conventional due process and equal protection standards, but a
TRAVEL virtual UNCONDITIONAL PERSONAL RIGHT."

But remember...you do not have a right to travel on MY property. You do not have a right to travel on anyone's PRIVATE property. And if the State Corporation owns the roadways, that is their PRIVATE property and you do NOT have a RIGHT to TRAVEL on IT.

LOST RIGHT So the complaint would not do you any good unless....within the
TO TRAVEL complaint you bring up the FRAUD of the UNLAWFUL CONVERSION of the
COMPLAINT tax revenue to buy the roadways and deeding it to themselves. Then
that was the DEPRIVATION of your RIGHT because it made the use by
you a priveledge with the money they took from you and caused
a DEPRIVATION of your RIGHT to travel.

TOOK RIGHT Instead of claiming you have a right to travel, claim that they
AWAY TOOK the right to travel AWAY from YOU by this FRAUD!

In some States the cops just write you a ticket and drive off, whether you sign the ticket or not. In other states if you do not sign the ticket you go straight to jail.

DURESS AS In Delaware a person can be charged with puting you UNDER DURESS
AFFIRMATIVE and DURESS can be used as an AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE. It is in the
DEFENSE statutes. If you threaten to put someone in jail because they did
not sign their name to a BILL then that is THREAT and COERCION and
that is against the law. It is true in all states. There are also
criminal statutes for puting someone in jail for doing the act of
coercion.

So it is a DEFENSE in one mode and a CRIMINAL act in another mode. You can utilize EITHER SIDE of it. We are learning how to go back at these people.

One of the guys in Delaware drives a truck for a living and he has

DOCUMENT
NOT
EVIDENCE

been talking to the other drivers about using such things as "without prejudice" when signing a traffic ticket and other documents. He told them that whenever they used those words under their names it created a problem in that the DOCUMENT it appears on CANNOT be used as EVIDENCE. The courts cannot ACCEPT that document as EVIDENCE.

"WITHOUT
PREJUD-
ICE"

From Bouvier's Law Dictionary comes the definition of the word COMPROMISE, and from all the way back to that time it seems to remain constant that, "it may, however, be considered settled that the letters or admissions containing the expression in substance that they are to be WITHOUT PREJUDICE will NOT be admitted in EVIDENCE." So if WITHOUT PREJUDICE shows up on the document it will not be admitted in evidence. (What about an expression not in substance?)

If you sign your traffic ticket WITHOUT PREJUDICE then it cannot be used in court as evidence. If you do not want to get locked up for not signing it then sign it WITHOUT PREJUDICE. When you get to the courtroom bring it up to the judge.

Don, the truck driver, told his fellow drivers about this and one of them went only about 25 miles down the way and a cop pulled him into a weigh station. He checked his truck and discovered that there was no fuel sticker on the truck. Some States charge \$1200 a year for the sticker. It is required to buy fuel in most States.

The fine was to be \$250 and he signed the ticket WITHOUT PREJUDICE and the cop drove away.

When the court date came up the cop presented his case and the judge said, "Wait a minute. I am looking at this ticket and I want to know if you have any other evidence in this case." They said that they did not. So the judge said, "In that case I am going to dismiss this case. Your ticket CANNOT be USED as EVIDENCE."

This truck driver could not have argued this case because he did not know HOW to argue the case. He could not have argued what was meant by using "WITHOUT PREJUDICE". In fact, he did not argue it! The judge took care of it for him. He was lucky that he got a nice judge. Others are not so lucky.

Another traffic case in Delaware was heard by the same level judge as the one just mentioned. The ticket was signed WITHOUT PREJUDICE but this judge said, "I do not care how it was signed. I do not want to hear any more of your silly stuff in this courtroom. Proceed with the trial." Same issue, same level court, but a different judge.

ARBITRARY
LAW IS
ANARCHY

That is an example of there being no LAW in this country. It is arbitrary. It is ANARCHY! There is ABSENCE or CONFUSION in law all through America today. That is ANARCHY!

Judges have said, "The law is whatever I say it is today, in my courtroom!"

Using WITHOUT PREJUDICE may work for you. If it does not work for you then there is another way.

CANNOT
FORCE
WAIVER

There are all types of laws in the COMMERCIAL LAW statutes of each State Code. There you will find that the judge cannot alter or ignore a statement of ANY kind, such as WITHOUT PREJUDICE, on any document. NO ONE can alter, remove, or ignore it. If they do they waive THEIR immunity because they DENIED you a right. A right CANNOT be forced into a waiver.

HERE IS THE LAW THAT STATES THIS.

15 USC
SEC 1693 L

COMMERCIAL STATUTES such as Title 15 U.S. Code, section 1693 L, headed as "WAIVER OF RIGHTS" states, "No writing or other agreement between a consumer or any other person may contain any provision which constitutes a WAIVER of any RIGHT conferred or cause of action created by this subchapter."

WAIVER OF
RIGHTS

YOU CANNOT BE COERCED INTO WAIVING YOUR RIGHTS!

If you sign a document that has a waiver of rights on it THE DOCUMENT IS VOID ON ITS FACE. Nothing at all can force you into a waiver of your rights in COMMERCIAL LAW.

TRAFFIC
TICKET
IS NOTICE

A TRAFFIC TICKET IS A COMMERCIAL AGREEMENT, A COMMERCIAL INSTRUMENT! It is patterned after the U.C.C. It is even called a NOTICE. It has a DEMAND for payment on there. It is a COMMERCIAL INSTRUMENT and, therefore, comes under those laws.

CRIMINAL
ACTION

Under COMMERCIAL LAW they cannot force you to waive your rights. If they do in any way, shape, or form, or if they REMOVE anything such as a claim of rights, like "WITHOUT PREJUDICE" or "ALL RIGHTS RESERVED", that you may write on the document, THEY may become LIABLE under CRIMINAL statutes in the codes. They CANNOT DEPRIVE you of the RIGHT that YOU CLAIMED, no matter WHAT they say or HOW MUCH they threaten or intimidate you. SUE THEM CRIMINALLY!

RECISSION

There is a RIGHT of RECISSION involved in COMMERCIAL transactions. The only way a RECISSION under COMMERCIAL law can be done is when BOTH parties consent to the RECISSION. Both parties have to sign the agreement of the RECISSION, otherwise it cannot be done. That means that you cannot rescind something on your own. You need an invitation from the other party agreeing that they will rescind something, like a signature.

OPERATION
OF LAW

BUT....BUT under COMMERCIAL law, anytime an obligor is established by the creation of a security interest agreement of any kind and it arises under OPERATION OF LAW, which means CONTRACT or AGREEMENT, the law only OPERATING after the CONTRACT or AGREEMENT is established, requires that the creator or maker of the instrument put on file or in writing to you, the obligee, that you have a FIXED NUMBER of days, not less than three, in which to RESCIND the agreement. If THIS is NOT in the agreement then the agreement is REVOKED.

AGREEMENT
REVOKED

TIME
PERIOD TO

Most agreements that are entered into by any of us do not contain any mention about the right that we have to be given a specific

RESCIND time period to RESCIND our signature, whether three days or thirty years. They just do not tell us that.

WAIVES All of these COMMERCIAL transactions are VOID on their face
RIGHTS because of the lack of NOTICE of the right to RESCIND, and even
 more of them are VOID on their face because they CONTAIN a WAIVER
 of RIGHTS in them.

MORTGAGE For an example, on the back of the first page of your mortgage
 document, somewhere close to the middle of the page, you will find
 a statement there that the BORROWER WAIVES his RIGHT to
 "PRESENTMENT, DISHONOR, and PROTEST". Those terms come right out
 of the U.C.C.!

MORTGAGE If you WAIVE those rights THE MORTGAGE IS VOID!
VOID

REMEDY TO Do NOT use this REMEDY unnecessarily. This could cause one heck of
REVOKE a mess in the banking system. But if you are losing your home, or
SIGNA- being put out of it, your family may be at the mercy of others.
TURE Then you could REVOKE your SIGNATURE on the mortgage agreement
 because you were forced into a WAIVER that they are not allowed to
 do under the law. Now the lender does not have a signed agreement
 to present to the court to prove that they have a claim.

We have used this process and the court has thrown the bank out.
They dismissed their case from the court. The bank was foreclosing
against a home where a wife and children would be on the street.
It was necessary to take that action.
The banks have lost every one of the cases where we have done this
and the people are not getting mortgage bills anymore. There is no
mortgage.

The deceptions are so intense that the wisest of men cannot know
right from wrong.

At one time the Social Security system looked like the right thing
to do, so I had no problem with joining. It was to be used as a
way to take care of the elderly and me in later years, so we were
told. But since I have found that it is just a way to confiscate
my property, and has nothing to do with taking care of older ones,
it no longer looks like the right thing to do. What is right today
may not look right tomorrow.

WALL There was a case about what we just talked about called Wall v.
v. King, 206 F 2d 878. This is a civil rights action for a fellow
KING who got a ticket for driving under the influence of alcohol. They
 suspended his driver's license. He said that was a DEPRIVATION of
 his property rights under the COLOR of LAW. He filed a civil
 rights case. He lost.

We can find more in cases that people lost than in the winning
cases. When the case is lost the reason is given in many of them.
And then we can find out what NOT to do so that we do not commit
the same mistakes, and lose the same stupid way.

DRIVER'S
LICENSE
WAIVED
RIGHTS

The end result of this case was that the court said that he had SIGNED an agreement to get a DRIVER'S LICENSE. If he SIGNED the AGREEMENT then he KNOWINGLY WAIVED ANY RIGHT that he would have that they could DEPRIVE by taking away what he got by SIGNING the agreement. Suspending his license was part of the AGREEMENT if he did not FOLLOW the RULES. He had agreed by SIGNATURE to follow the RULES so they had the RIGHT to take his license. He did NOT lose anything.

If you have a DRIVER'S LICENSE you do NOT have a right, YOU WAIVED IT!

NOT TOLD
OF WAIVER

DID YOU KNOW THAT YOU WERE PROMPTED INTO A "WAIVER OF RIGHTS" by getting a driver's license? Did they have a "good faith" obligation to tell you that you were PROMPTED into a WAIVER of RIGHTS by getting a driver's license and that it was a PRIVELEDGE that they were extending you, and that you were WAIVING ALL your NATURAL RIGHTS by accepting the license? But they did not tell you that.

COLOR OF
LAW ACTION

In this case they quote out of Civil Rights Key 1, from West's Key Publication stating, "Action taken by State official in purported exercise of authority, conferred by State, is action under color of law." That means that ANY action at all taken by a State official under ANY state statute is an action done under color of law.

MUST
COUNTER
ORIGINAL

This guy that we were talking about that filed the civil rights case, because they took his driver's license away as a result of being given a ticket for DUI, lost the case because he did not show any FRAUD. He did not bring up any COUNTER of any kind against the original agreement.

I think we could take the same basic pattern of this case, work the FRAUD of the roads into this pattern of a case, and come up with a winner. But I do not have a reason to do this. They have not bothered me. I do not have any tickets for driving without a license. I might get one soon.

WALL
v.
KING

COMPLAINT
IN LYNCH
v.
H.F.C.

Any of you that do have a ticket ought to consider using Wall vs. King as the guideline and Lynch vs. Household Finance. The last time I was down here I brought what the lawyer had drawn up as a complaint in Lynch vs. Household Finance. The lawyer was a young man just out of law school who took a real interest in his work and did a terrific job of putting the case together. It was very successful in the SUPREME COURT with the decision that came down in favor of the rights of the little people, like us and Mrs. Lynch.

I think that it is worth following. And if you follow that kind of a layout, and work the details in accordance with the way this Wall vs. King case goes into the function of the claim of FRAUD from the very beginning, by the CONVERSION of the ROADS, I think you would be putting together a very interesting case against the cop or the judge, or anyone else, such as the town, being it is a town cop.

By the way, if you sue the town or county, or if you sue the State,...they are CORPORATIONS. Corporations are artificial PERSONS. They are FICTIONS. They appear to be real persons but they are not real at all. They have names and addresses just like other persons but they are not human beings. (note: A human being does not have an address, but a corporation must have an address to exist. A human being may dwell or SOJOURN where he receives his mail or he may choose not to be there at all, or he may choose to receive mail at many locations which have been assigned an "address" by the USPS, which is separate from the POST OFFICE.)

ADDRESS

PERSONAL
CAPACITYNO
IMMUNITY

Since they are persons they have a political, or business, capacity and a personal capacity. So a corporation can be sued in its personal capacity for the actions that it may have done. Then it has no immunities. The corporate veil of protection is blown completely away by suing it in its personal capacity. That is just like the government official's political immunity claims are blown completely away when you sue him in his personal capacity. So if you go after the town because the town cop wrote you a ticket, and if you put the kind of a case together that we just talked about, go after them in their personal capacities and include the cop and the town.

It would be nice to be able to shut down some of these town governments. That would shut down zoning laws and all this building permit nonsense and would take an awful lot of pressure off the good AMERICAN PEOPLE. They would not have to pay so much.

CLOSE THE
GOVERNMENT

The State would not get the money that it needs to pay back the debt that it owes. That debt would finally get so high that the State Government would have to close. When that happens the U.S. Government would have to close. When they close the doors the PEOPLE will be free again, not tied to this enslavement of the giant systems of government.

PAPER
ARROWS

Cases like these, filed all around the country, can help make these changes. They will be use like "paper arrows" to shoot into the courts to effect the fall similar to the Roman Empire.

Shoot your arrows straight at Babylon!

Everytime we hit the government with one of these cases it is like hitting them with an ARROW and every one will wound them.

There were mistakes made in another area years ago. The area was CIVIL RIGHTS. We were lead away from using the civil rights legislation available to us. We were lead away by not wanting to be a part of the Civil Rights Movement.

TITLE 18, We went to the police department and asked the police to bring

SECT. 242 charges of deprivation of rights under "color of law" under TITLE 18, SEC 242 against another government official. They ignored us. So we went to the U.S. Attorney's Office and asked him. He ignored us.

We never did figure out how to file a deprivation of rights under "color of law", TITLE 18, SEC 241 & 242 case.

You cannot. You have no right to do so. You have no authority to act.

USCS, TITLE 18, SEC 242 mentions a case of a defendant who filed suit from within a jail. He was a prisoner. It states, "PERSONS TO INSTITUTE PROSECUTION - prisoner could not properly, personally, institute criminal proceedings against State and its officers for violation of his rights under color of law. Any such complaint should have been sent to the U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S Office."

U.S.
ATTORNEY
GENERAL

(This book did not say the U.S. A/G, it said U.S. Attorney.)

I got the court case used as a reference and it specifically said the U.S. Attorney General.

So there must be a difference between U.S. Attorney and U.S. A/G. There is a big difference. The U.S. Attorneys are the attorneys hired by, and are on a retainer for, the CORPORATION known as the United States.

UNITED
STATES
ATTORNEY

The U.S. A/G is completely different. The rules set up by Congress are completely different than for U.S. Attorneys. There is a definite separation there.

The U.S. A/G will act in cases that the U.S. Attorney will not even touch. There is a difference. You must send a complaint to the U.S. A/G's Office.

The case also noted that the U.S. A/G had the power to instigate an investigation of the complaint by the FBI. So the FBI will investigate your complaint of civil rights violations if it is filed with the U.S. A/G's Office.

FBI

So, if you have a civil rights complaint under TITLE 42, SEC 1983, in the CIVIL ARENA, and you want to press this party a little bit further, you file a SEPARATE request for a CRIMINAL complaint to the U.S. A/G. These government officials are not anxious to be sued or to be charged with a criminal offense.

SEPARATE
CRIMINAL
COMPLAINT

If you put enough pressure on like this by beginning to file some of these types of suits in a case that is really pressing you they may well back off. They may also get a lot more nasty. If they do, you just write a SECOND letter ADDING the nasty stuff that they have just done to you as an ADDITIONAL DEPRIVATION and try to force the issue for an investigation.

ADDITIONAL
DEPRIV-
ATION

If an investigation starts that is when they will back off. We have gotten them in this position a couple of times but we have not been successful yet in getting them to actually act. They come up with weak excuses as to why the officer acted that way, or say it was only this one time. Not true.

They take the side of the official or officer because of the lack of suits that come up like this. If there were more of these types of suits filed they may have to take a more serious course of action against the government servants. More people need to file these types of complaints.

PEONAGE

Under this ridiculous set of civil rights statutes stemming from the 13th and 14th Amendments, particularly the 13th, putting you in jail because you did not pay a debt is called PEONAGE. There is a whole series of statutes in TITLE 18 USC called the "peonage laws". They start at SEC 51.

LIABLE
TO YOU

There are lists of cases from about 1880 to 1991 that show that ANY PARTY WHO PUTS YOU IN JAIL FOR A DEBT IS LIABLE TO YOU. It also says that they are criminally liable if the government wishes to proceed against them criminally if they put you in jail for a debt.

Dave DeRiemer Story:

TICKET
FROM E.P.A.
IS U.C.C.

Dave had a piece of rental property with a leak in the septic tank that was reported to the government by his tenant. The government came out and wrote a ticket to Dave. The ticket looked like a traffic ticket but it was from the EPA.

The ticket of \$125 was for not getting a permit to let the septic tank leak on the lawn. Not because it leaked, but because he did not get a permit to let it leak!

They DID NOT SIGN THE COMPLAINT, they just printed their names on it.

The complaint has a space on it where the Justice of the Peace for Delaware Courts is supposed to sign as a witness that the government agency signed the complaint. THEY DID NOT SIGN IT. They just PRINTED their names and it is doubtful whether they even went to the Justice of the Peace, because HE DID NOT SIGN IT EITHER.

The instrument is now LACKING two of the REQUIREMENTS of the LAW.

The government sent Dave NOTICE of the COMPLAINT and a copy of it. So Dave sent a plumber and fixed the problem. No more leak.

SENT
ANOTHER
BILL PER
U.C.C.

The government flunkies decided to pursue the collection of the \$125 owed on the ticket and sent him a second notice and said that he had to be in court. But the letter went back to the court unopened and stamped "return to sender". So Dave never got the notice that he was supposed to be in court.

But because he never showed up in court the two flunkies filled out an application for a CAPEAS and the judge of the Common Pleas Court ISSUED the capeas.

The CAPEAS is merely a "warrant for arrest." It is an old common

CAPEAS

law approach to an arrest warrant. It was basically oriented around DEBT.

In Delaware's law statutes it says that a CAPEAS will not be issued to any CITIZEN or PERSON in the State of Delaware unless, first, there are a praecipe, judgement, and affidavit in the court clerk's office stating that the debt is due and owing and that the DEBTOR is expected to abscond with anything of value, or property that might be collectible.

Dave owned several houses and was not any threat to flee over \$125. They DID NOT do the AFFIDAVIT stating that the debt was DUE AND OWING. The law says that they will NOT ISSUE the capeas unless all three are on file. The AFFIDAVIT has to be there otherwise the capeas will not be issued. The question arises as to WHY the judge would SIGN the CAPEAS if he knows the AFFIDIVIT has to be there.

This whole thing sounds as if there are several government officials bending the law here.

They came out to Dave's house and wanted to EXECUTE the capeas and arrest Dave. So they pulled out their guns and flashed them around in front of him and threatened to arrest him. He shut the door and called the clerk of the court and asked her if she would FAX him everything that was on file in the clerk's office. She agreed to do that immediately and with a friendly tone. She was a nice person, as most of them are.

AFFIDAVIT
MUST BE
IN FILE

The AFFIDAVIT was not in the file. So Dave advised them that they would be liable. They stated that they did not care, they would arrest him anyway. So dave said that he was going to make them wait a little while for him to be arrested.

The agents said that if he did not come with them immediately they would call for help. They did just that and the SWAT teams came out. The regular State Police showed up. The Lewes, Delaware Police came out and the Ferry Police from the ferry boat landing. There were about 100 cops on Dave's front lawn waiting for Dave to come out.

In the meantime, the news media reported that there was a "hostage situation". Dave liked it because he was getting news coverage and the stand-off went on for about six hours. The media had made a mistake about the situation and apologized and said that the police had him held up in the house and there were no hostages.

But maybe they were correct. Dave WAS being held HOSTAGE by the POLICE on his front lawn.

Dave called us and then called a good friend who was a lawyer and the police let the lawyer in to talk with Dave. They always let a lawyer in but would never let any of us in. (Lawyers were allowed in to talk to David Koresh at Waco.)

The lawyer told him to let the police arrest him and that it sounded as though Dave had an interesting case. So he did that.

The police took him down to the station and then took him to the local county jail. The people at the county jail told him that there was a regulation that he had to take a blood test before

they could let him in with the rest of the prisoners. They said they needed to know whether or not he had A.I.D.S.

REFUSED
BLOOD
TEST

He refused to allow them to stick anything in his arm because he said THEY may GIVE HIM A.I.D.S. if the needle was dirty. And now there was another stand-off, and it went on for five weeks.

Dave flatly refused to let them punch holes in his body and play around with his blood. So they put him in confinement away from the other prisoners. He had no telephone, no visitors, no mail, and no priveledges. That was a mistake on our part!

Dave had put himself in a position that he could not get in touch with us and we could not get in touch with him from outside. So we could not do any actions like the McLaughlin case that I talked about earlier because he REFUSED to SIGN their documents. But we needed Dave's signature on the complaint and we could not even ask him if he wanted to do the action and then instruct him how he should argue the case if he did get taken into the court.

With no communication we could not do anything for Dave!

COMPLAINT
BY A
PRISONER

We decided not to let this happen again. There is a way to PREVENT this from taking place. The U.S. DISTRICT COURT will provide a form upon request known as "INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILING A COMPLAINT BY A PRISONER", under the CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, Title 42 USC, section 1983. The instructions are on one page. There are about three pages to fill in the blanks. These actions are very simple to do, especially for a prisoner.

You fill in the blanks, answer the questions, and lay out your claim. You then ask for your relief. It states, "Do not enclose a brief." They will search the law for you. That is wonderful!

Keep in mind that this is for a PRISONER. They search the law and all that is needed is for the prisoner to SIGN at the bottom. But that was the problem here. We could not get in to Dave to sign the form.

PREVENTION

To prevent this in the future we all should have one of these forms signed and ready to go in case any of us gets in this same predicament. IT IS PLACED WHERE OUR FAMILY OR FRIENDS CAN GET HOLD OF IT. Now if anything like that happens they can fill it out with help from others if necessary and file it since it is already signed by the one in jail.

We have discussed that we would file a "McLaughlin case" and refuse to sign any of the documents put in front of us by the police at the time of arrest, or any thing presented at the jail, and DEMAND a probable cause hearing. Then we would file the case because they did not give the probable cause hearing and we had not yet given consent by our signatures. So they would be holding us without probable cause.

With all this time gone by in Dave's case we decided he should go ahead and sign and file a counterclaim later because they did not have the affidavit from the Justice of the Peace that we had mentioned earlier.

WHEN

We also found out from a friendly judge that if the AFFIDAVIT is

AFFIDAVIT MISSING MISSING the State is LIABLE and ALL the parties involved are LIABLE for CIVIL and CRIMINAL action.

Now it must be put into a COUNTERCOMPLAINT.

The jailhouse folks broke down some and we were able to get through to Dave and we told him what we thought he ought to do. We told him to go ahead and sign. He did, "RESERVING ALL RIGHTS", and we bailed him out.

Signing grants them jurisdiction. There is no right to a COUNTERCOMPLAINT unless they DO HAVE jurisdiction. So to give them jurisdiction the prisoner must sign to give his consent so jurisdiction can be established in order to put in the counter-complaint.

This is touchy but it will work.

DENIED
MOTION
TO DISMISS

We laid the ground work for the countercomplaint by following the rules and filing the proper motions. We had a hearing Friday. I called my wife Friday night, two days ago, and she had talked to Dave. Dave told her that the court did what I said that they would do. They denied the motion to dismiss.

That was good. They were playing right into our hands. We will get the judges in three courts involved. We will also get the State of Delaware, the two flunkies from the EPA, and 100 cops plus the warden at the jail.

Dave will be busy for a long time working on lawsuits, maybe a year or more.

All of this would have not been necessary if we had already had the form with Dave's signature on it to file immediately when he was arrested.

PRISONER

INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF

They claim that they will respond to a PRISONER in three days which is much faster than anyone else. That does not mean that they will come down with a JUDGEMENT. But if you were to ask for INJUNCTIVE RELIEF they will respond with TEMPORARY injunctive relief in three days.

If you want to get out because they have not proven PROBABLE CAUSE and you want INJUNCTIVE RELIEF to let you out they will let you out PROVIDED that you AGREE that you will come back if they say that they are going to end the injunctive relief. They just might end the relief. You never know what these clowns will do. They all seem to act differently.

ALLODIAL
TITLE

I want to talk about property and what to do about getting back deeds and such, actually recovering the deed so that you end up with ALLODIAL TITLE.

HOLDER IN
DUE COURSE

Section 3-305 of the UCC, the rights of a holder in due course, says that the HOLDER TAKES the instrument FREE from ANY CLAIMS to it by ANY person. That means that ALL RIGHT to the property is in

the hands of the HOLDER of the instrument and NOT in the hands of the person named as the OWNER. You do not even have a RIGHT to claim anything ON the property.

The owner lost all of his right to the property.

A deed is supposed to transfer title from one owner to another owner. Title is an imaginary thing, it is not real. It never has been real. It goes with the property.

In the ancient days they picked up a handful of dirt and handed it to you. That handful represented the whole piece of land that you were buying, and you were "seised" of the ownership of the property. People were so honest back then that you did not need to write up a document and file it in a government record. There was no "thieving government" to steal it.

But the way it works now is the "thieving government" actually steals the right to the property away from you by getting you to FILE the DEED in their records.

FEUDAL TITLE IS LIMITED TITLE

In the old days the title was ALLODIAL. The King destroyed that by making FEUDAL TITLE in England. The Roman Empire also destroyed it by FEUDAL TITLE. Feudal title meant LIMITED TITLE. At the pleasure of the King or of the Roman Empire you were allowed to live on the property for a fixed period of time. The fixed period could vary from months to many years or even a lifetime. But at the end of the fixed time that the deed expressed that the property was to be used by you, the property reverted back to the King or the Roman Empire.

They did not go quite that far in this country. There was, at least, allodial title in this country. That was a reason that caused people to leave England and come here to America...to own property and to have property rights.

ALLODIAL TITLE

ALLODIAL TITLE meant that the piece of paper, or whatever it was that identified the property, was in YOUR HANDS. No one else had ANY interest in the property in ANY way. They would have no interest in the rights, the use, or the time to be held by you. None of those things, and others not mentioned, were divided among two or more people. It was all actually "seised" in you, the one person. That was ALLODIAL TITLE.

Today if the HOLDER of the instrument acquires the right of HOLDER IN DUE COURSE there is a SHARED ownership of the property. So it is no longer allodial. It does not matter whether it is done with a DEED, or with a LAND PATENT, or any of the other things that people are finding to be filed in the records of the court. They are all still ways that produce an instrument and there is still a HOLDER IN DUE COURSE which has ALL the RIGHT in the property.

THERE IS NO ALLODIAL TITLE WHEN THE PROPERTY IS FILED IN THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF THE COURT!

If you want allodial title you must get the TITLE and the DEED, and ANY and ALL papers referring to that property, out of the hands of anyone else and into YOUR HANDS ONLY.

THERE IS A WAY TO DO THIS!

We should look up everything we can on the word COLOR as it appears, or is related to, COLOR OF LAW. In "Words and Phrases" from the shelf of the University of Maryland Law Library, color is defined very well. It also defines a COLORABLE TITLE.

COLORABLE
TITLE

COLORABLE TITLE is a title which gives the APPEARANCE that the title is in your hands, but it is not really there. It has the APPEARANCE of being the real thing but it is not real at all. The deed that we have today that is filed in THEIR hands and in our hands, has the appearance that we have the ownership to the property but they have the rights. We do not have all of the ownership. It is COLORABLE.

ALL DEEDS AND TITLES TODAY ARE COLORABLE.

DEFECTIVE
CONVEY-
ANCE

COLORABLE TITLE, under which a good title may be acquired by ADVERSE POSSESSION, means a writing which, on its face, purports to convey title to realty, but may not convey TRUE TITLE for WANT of title in GRANTOR, or because of DEFECTIVE mode of conveyance.

Now their grabbing a copy of the deed and putting it in their records, removing the right of property from you, is a defect in the mode of conveyance. Along with the process of conveyance from me to you, when I sold my house to you, and you bought it, an honest system would guarantee that everything that was there, and all right, title, and interest to it, conveyed to you when you paid me for it.

"SHOULD"
IS NOT
"MUST"

So if some dirty lawyer comes along and takes the deed over and files it in the public record he thinks he has done what he was required by law to do. The law states that it SHOULD be filed. It does not state that it MUST be filed. But the lawyer is a good government agent and if it states that it SHOULD be filed he WILL file it. He is looking for praise and a raise. He is trained to do what the government says. He is stealing the right of property from you and is not aware that he is doing it. He is making the State an interested party in the property as HOLDER IN DUE COURSE and the State now has ALL the right to the property.

CLAIMS
FILED

All claims SHOULD be filed is expressed by the statutes because it is beneficial to the government if the claims ARE FILED. But it does not say MUST. The government COULD NOT BECOME holder in due course if the claims were not filed. That is why the statute states that it SHOULD be filed. It is in the government's interest to be filed in public record, IN COURT.

DEFECT IN
CONVEY-
ANCE

Since the State has all the right to the property, that is how they have an interest in it, and that is a DEFECT IN THE CONVEYANCE. A part of what was just bought was immediately lost. This is what happens the first time the property is bought.

The next time the property is bought it is automatic because of what the book stated in the sentence previously in the definition of COLOR OF TITLE: "...which on its face purports to convey title to realty but may not convey TRUE TITLE for WANT of title in GRANTOR." Once this thing has been filed the first time and the right of title has been removed, and it is sold to someone else, they do not get TRUE TITLE for want of the title not being in the

sellers hands. It is in the hands of the State.

Deeds were always held in the hands of the people before 1930. Now the deeds are filed in PUBLIC RECORD. There is no allodial title if it is filed in court. Now no one has true title to pass to the next buyer. It is being passed DEFECTIVELY due to the fact that it lacks the RIGHT of PROPERTY which is held by the STATE.

TRUE
BANK

This makes the court the true banks in this country. Look up the definition of BANK in the law dictionary. A bank is a court.

ADVERSE
POSSESSION

It may be gotten back by ADVERSE POSSESSION. There is a type of court case known as an "adverse possession CLAIM" that may be filed. All that needs to be done is to explain how this fraud was perpetrated, who did it, and that the holder in due course now adversely holds the right to the property and that the true owner wants it back.

There is also another way to get the deed back. The sheriff will go in and bring it out to you if it is done right. If the county holds your property and they put it up as collateral to borrow money they are getting a benefit from it. The county never paid for the benefit.

The purchaser paid for the property, paid the fee to the State so that they will accept the property, and hold it for the purchaser. Then the purchaser pays rent to use the possession in a piece of property in which the State owns all of the RIGHT. The last two are known as filing fees and property taxes, respectively. The taxes, or rent, is paid over and over every year. It is paid JUST because it is FILED.

NOTICE
AND DEMAND

It is not an honest act to manipulate property from anyone. You have the right to do something about that act. You could send the government a BILL for the full value of the property. Since they are holding your property, let them know that you want them to pay you. Send them a NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR PAYMENT.

They will ignore it. That is good. That is what you want. Send it by certified mail, process service, or courier. When you have proof that they have received it you must give them about 30 days to respond to it. They must pay the bill or counterclaim that they do not owe the money, and for a specific reason.

If they fail to do either one of the two things just mentioned by the end of the 30 days, plus five days to allow for mail, send a second NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR PAYMENT. Get proof of their receiving it. Give them 15 days to reply.

THEY MUST
RESPOND

After the 15 days give them another 5 days for the mail to be delivered. They MUST respond specifically. Such as, "You said that I owe you money for this reason. I do not owe you money for this reason because I do not have the deed in my hands." Just replying, "I do not owe this" is not sufficient to answer a NOTICE AND DEMAND for payment.

They cannot answer that they do not have the deed in their hands because they do!!

So they will not answer. Every time they do not answer you get to

NOTICE OF
DEFAULT do the next step in the procedure. The next step in the procedure is to send them a notice of default with a copy of each of the first two NOTICE AND DEMAND citations and the proof of service for each.

RULE 55 When they still ignore it you must then go to the State Court Rule for your State. It will be called DEFAULT. It is rule 55 in the
DEFAULT U.S. District Court Rules.

DEFAULT Entry of the DEFAULT is automatic by the court clerk. There is no
AUTOMATIC need to go in front of a judge. All that is required is an AFFADAVIT that the first and last notices were sent and the final demand was sent. The proofs of services must be in there too. Then you must write a request to the court that the court grant DEFAULT JUDGEMENT based on the AFFADAVIT. When these two steps are done you go to the court clerk's counter and you pay them.

What you are doing is filing a complaint for DEFAULT JUDGEMENT. There is always a fee to be paid to the court when you file a complaint.

The court clerk will then send you up to the judge and the judge will wait 30 more days. A copy of all of this must be sent again to the person who is in DEFAULT, making them aware that it is now in the hands of the court.

They must petition the court. If they fail to petition the court for a hearing within 30 days the judge will tell the court clerk that it is alright to sign the DEFAULT JUDGEMENT and the clerk will do so, according to law.

WRIT OF You still do not have much, other than the decision. You must then
EXECUTION file another complaint. It is called a "REQUEST FOR A WRIT OF EXECUTION". In some states it may be a request for a "WRIT OF CAPEAS".

The court clerk will provide the forms to petition the sheriff to execute this collection of the money, or the property, or whatever is named on the form. You will tell the sheriff to bring it back to you. He will follow the instructions.

If you want the sheriff to go to the county's bank account and pay you the amount you asked for he will do that. If you have put an alternative to that, such as taking the deed to the property out of the court records and bringing it to you, he will do that if the first alternative is impossible.

The deed must be taken out of the deed platt book and returned to you, along with the UCC-1 forms that are in the vault that the lawyer filed when you bought the property.

They no longer have HOLDER IN DUE COURSE rights in YOUR REAL PROPERTY!!

YOU OWN THE LAND, HAVE THE TITLE, AND OWN ALL THE PROPERTY IN THE LAND.

CERTIFIED MAIL # _____

From (your name) a nonresident
alien to all corporate
governments,
c/o (where you pick up mail)
(town of same)
(state spelled out full)
(no zip) America
(date)

NOTICE AND DEMAND

To (foreclosing lender):

NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR EXHIBITION OR PRESENTMENT WITHOUT DISHONOR.

Demand is hereby served in accordance with State and Federal laws, statutes, and subsequent index codes, that you produce the written authority granted by the State of (state name) Legislature in (capitol) to your bank to "make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts", and any written instrument, document, contract or agreement, bearing my "authorized" signature, in which I agree to be held liable and chargeable to any bona fide valid claim of debt by me, payable to your bank, within ten (10) days from receipt of this NOTICE AND DEMAND.

Your failure will be the admission of the fraud attempting to be perpetrated upon me by you and your agency bank. Specific performance by you, as initially purported, is an alternative.

"Silence can only be equated with fraud when there is a legal or moral duty to speak, or when an inquiry left unanswered would be intentionally misleading. ...We cannot condone this shocking conduct... If that is the case we hope our message is clear. This sort of deception will not be tolerated and if this is "routine" it should be corrected immediately." U.S. v. Tweel, 550 F.2d 297, 299-300 (1977).

The continued silence, by any failure to produce or to deny by your bank corporation, strongly suggests the validity of my claim of my not being subject to bank debt claim forms. It would seem most appropriate for your counsel to review their erroneous position.

"Fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents, and even judgements." U.S. v. Throckmorton, 98 U.S. 61, 651.

You have ten (10) days to respond.

Sincerely,

Nonresident alien to all
corporate governments,
Natural American human being.

(your name)
c/o _____
(where you pick up mail)
(box # or # and street)

(town) NON DOMESTIC _____ State, America
(fully spell state name)

NOTICE OF REVOCATION OF SIGNATURE AND POWER OF ATTORNEY AND CONSENT

To whom it may concern:

I, _____, an inhabitant located in _____ County,
(your name) (county name)
_____ State, but not the corporate body politic of either,
(name of state)

and a natural human being of the American Republic Nation, do hereby
revoke and make void, per U.C.C. section 2-608 ab initio, all
signatures on any instruments and any consent of express or implied
power of attorney therewith, in fact or assumption, signed either by me
or anyone acting as my agent, or unsigned, as it pertains to the stated
_____ and any and all

(birth certificate, marriage license, etc.)

certificates issued by _____ governmental/quasi govern-
(name of department)

mental entities, due to the use of various elements of fraud and
misrepresentation, duress, coercion, mistake, or bankruptcy, as per
U.C.C. section 1-103, by said agencies/entities. I hereby cancel,
repudiate, and refuse to accept any benefit, franchises and/or
privileges attached to the above mentioned item/items.

I, _____, do hereby revoke, cancel, annul, repeal, dismiss,
(your name)

discharge, extract, withdraw, abrogate, recant, negate, obliterate,
delete, nullify, efface, erase, expunge, excise, strike, repudiate,
wipe out, disavow, recall, renounce, destroy, abjure, disclaim, disown,
reject, and relinquish all signatures and powers of attorney, in fact
or assumption, with or without my consent and/or knowledge, as it
pertains to any and all property, real or personal, tangible or
intangible, corporeal or incorporeal, obtained in the past, present, or
future. I am the sole and absolute possessor and owner and possess
absolute unqualified full right allodial title to any and all such
property, as a member of the American Republic, with no effectively
connected trade or business within the United States or the State of
_____ "Body Politic" corporation.

(name of state)

This instrument replaces, cancels, and repudiates the prior instrument
filed by me or my agent with the _____ Office and

(department of government)

any and all other governmental entities anywhere which may execute on
said prior instrument(s), and this document shall become a permanent
part of the records of the above named government agency. All such
instruments are without prejudice to me and non assumptit to you.

Witness my hand this _____ day of _____ 19__.

(your name)

Witnessed by:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY
PENNSYLVANIA REPUBLIC

G.E. Capital Mortgage Services, Inc.)
f/k/a Travelers Mortgage Services Inc.)

Civil Action - Law

No. 92-20648

v.)

Newton B. De Riemer and)
Denise De Riemer)

To: G.E. Capital Mortgage Services, Inc.
f/k/a/ Travelers Mortgage Services, Inc.

NOTICE OF DEFAULT

You have defaulted and failed to reply or comply with the NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR EXHIBITION OR PRESENTMENT WITHOUT DISHONOR filed on (date) with this Court re. the above action in which DEMAND was made to produce (prior to HEARING April 14, 1993) your authorization by the State Legislature to have made "anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts." (copy enclosed)

By your DEFAULT you have admitted that you/your lending institution do not and never have had authority to have created a false claim of now existing debt. Such false claim by you is a fraud being attempted to be perpetrated on me/us while attempting to utilize the good offices of this Court to collect such spurious and false debt claim.

You have 5 days to "cure the Default" or I/We Demand that you immediately return any and all property and/or monies stolen or otherwise collected unlawfully, and immediate removal of any levys, liens, mortgage liens, and/or Notices of Levys or Liens.

Further I/We Demand immediate return of any and all payments which I/We may have inadvertantly made to you/your lending institution based upon your admitted previous fraudulent claim of debt, from the date of alleged inception of the alleged loan to today's date.

Your failure to immediately complete restitution to me/us, as above, will be met with Summons and Complaint, both Civil and Criminal, in your personal, as well as your corporate, capacity in Federal District Court. IMMEDIATE COMPLIANCE DEMANDED

Date: _____

Newton B. De Riemer

Denise De Reimer

[After everything is returned, sue the lender anyway for damages times THREE under Title 42, section 1983, Civil Rights claim where "government employees have exceeded their constitutional and civil (Legislative granted) rights by depriving you of your unalienable, inherent, Natural (God-given) property rights, as secured by the Constitution against infringement from government."]

THEIR QUESTIONS...MY ANSWERS, AND REASONS

Q. - Are you John Doe?

A. - No.

R. - I am not my name. My name and my body are two very different entities. I can even change my name but my body will be the same.

Q. - What is your address?

A. - I do not have an address.

R. - Only pieces of real property, land, have addresses. They are assigned by the U.S. Postal Service, formerly the Post Office Department. The address stays with a piece of property, even if the human being that stays there dies or moves to another piece of land with a different address.

Q. - Where do you live?

A. - In my body.

R. - Life outside of my body does not belong to me. I am alive in my body. I "live" in my body.

Q. - Where is your home?

A. - Abroad.

R. - My home is beyond the rule of admiralty jurisdiction. It is "beyond the seas". It is abroad.

Q. - What is your Social Security number?

A. - I do not have one.

R. - Even if I am carrying a Social Security card with a number on it, the number does not belong to me. It belongs to the Social Security Administration. It is their number and NOT MINE. They allow me to use it if I choose, but not for purposes of identification. I choose to not use it. Using it is voluntary and I volunteer not to use it.

ABOUT SOME LAWYERS

You are about to read the names of twelve of the nation's most prominent lawyers. One of these men was a law school dropout. He quit law school before he was finished. He was not proud of it. See if you can guess his name.

PATRICK HENRY passed his oral bar examinations in 1760 and within three years had handled more than 1100 cases. He was a member of the Continental Congress and later governor of Virginia.

JOHN JAY was admitted to the bar in 1768, subsequently distinguishing himself as the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

JOHN MARSHALL passed his bar exams in 1780 and later became a Supreme Court Chief Justice.

WILLIAM WIRT was barely twenty when he practiced law in Culpepper County, Virginia and he eventually became United States Attorney General.

ROGER TANEY was admitted to practice in 1799, served as first Secretary of the Treasury, and then as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

DANIEL WEBSTER was admitted to the Boston bar in 1805 and established a phenomenal legal reputation and also served as Secretary of State in 1841.

SALMON CHASE gained his early prominence as a defense attorney for runaway slaves and also later became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN gained his experience as a lawyer and became the 16th president of the United States.

STEVEN DOUGLAS was admitted to the bar in 1834. He later became a Representative and then a Senator from Illinois. He is best remembered for his debates with Lincoln.

CLARENCE DARROW was a lawyer of world renown whose most famous case was the Scopes case, the so called Monkey Trial of 1925.

ROBERT STOREY was born in 1893 and served as president of the American Bar Association in 1952 and 1953.

Strom Thurmond was admitted to the bar in 1930 and later became governor of South Carolina and then Senator from that state.

Remember that one of these distinguished gentlemen is a law school dropout. He abandoned law school after his first year and NEVER returned.

CLARENCE DARROW was that dropout!

That is right. CLARENCE DARROW, the name that the entire world associates with the practice of law, attended law school for only one year. He did not distinguish himself by that and studied law on his own.

In conclusion it should be stated here that the other eleven DISTINGUISHED American lawyers could not have dropped out of law school because they never went to law school at all!

Remember this the next time a judge or a lawyer says to you that "the man who represents himself has a fool for a client".

TITLES OF UNITED STATES CODE

- | | |
|--|--|
| *1. General Provisions. | 27. Intoxicating Liquors. |
| 2. The Congress. | *28. Judiciary and Judicial Procedure; and Appendix. |
| *3. The President. | 29. Labor. |
| *4. Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States. | 30. Mineral Lands and Mining. |
| *5. Government Organization and Employees; and Appendix. | *31. Money and Finance. |
| †6. [Surety Bonds.] | *32. National Guard. |
| 7. Agriculture. | 33. Navigation and Navigable Waters. |
| 8. Aliens and Nationality. | †34. [Navy.] |
| *9. Arbitration. | *35. Patents. |
| *10. Armed Forces; and Appendix. | 36. Patriotic Societies and Observances. |
| *11. Bankruptcy; and Appendix. | *37. Pay and Allowances of the Uniformed Services. |
| 12. Banks and Banking. | *38. Veterans' Benefits. |
| *13. Census. | *39. Postal Service. |
| *14. Coast Guard. | 40. Public Buildings, Property, and Works. |
| 15. Commerce and Trade. | 41. Public Contracts. |
| 16. Conservation. | 42. The Public Health and Welfare. |
| *17. Copyrights. | 43. Public Lands. |
| *18. Crimes and Criminal Procedure; and Appendix. | *44. Public Printing and Documents. |
| 19. Customs Duties. | 45. Railroads. |
| 20. Education. | 46. Shipping. |
| 21. Food and Drugs. | 47. Telegraphs, Telephones, and Radiotelegraphs. |
| 22. Foreign Relations and Intercourse. | 48. Territories and Insular Possessions. |
| *23. Highways. | *49. Transportation; and Appendix. |
| 24. Hospitals and Asylums. | 50. War and National Defense; and Appendix. |
| 25. Indians. | |
| 26. Internal Revenue Code. | |

*This title has been enacted as law. However, any Appendix to this title has not been enacted as law.

†This title was enacted as law and has been repealed by the enactment of Title 31.

†This title has been eliminated by the enactment of Title 10.

(" CREATURE OF LAW" VS CREATURE OF GOD)

318

COR

COR

office. It not unfrequently happens that the public mind is deeply impressed with the guilt of the accused, and when probably he is guilty, and yet the imperfections of the early examinations leave no alternative to the jury but to acquit. It is proper in most cases to procure the examination to be made by a physician, and in some cases, it is his duty. 4 Car. & P. 571.

CORPORAL. An epithet for anything belonging to the body, as, corporal punishment, for punishment inflicted on the person of the criminal; corporal oath, which is an oath by the party who takes it being obliged to lay his hand on the Bible.

CORPORAL, in the army. A non-commissioned officer in a battalion of infantry.

CORPORAL TOUCH. It was once decided that before a seller of personal property could be said to have stopped it in transitu, so as to regain the possession of it, it was necessary that it should come to his corporal touch. 3 T. R. 406; 5 East, 184. But the contrary is now settled. These words were used merely as a figurative expression. 3 T. R. 404; 5 East, 184.

CORPORATION. An aggregate corporation is an ideal body, created by law, composed of individuals united under a common name, the members of which succeed each other, so that the body continues the same, notwithstanding the changes of the individuals who compose it, and which for certain purposes is considered as a natural person. Brown's Civ. Law, 99; Civ. Code of Lo. art. 418; 2 Kent's Com. 215. Mr. Kyd, (Corpor. vol. 1, p. 13,) defines a corporation as follows: "A corporation, or body politic, or body incorporate, is a collection of many individuals united in one body, under a special denomination, having perpetual succession under an artificial form, and vested by the policy of the law, with a capacity of acting in several respects as an individual, particularly of taking and granting property, contracting obligations, and of suing and being sued; of enjoying privileges and immunities in common, and of exercising a variety of political rights, more or less extensive, according to the design of its institution, or the powers conferred upon it, either at the time of its creation, or at any subsequent period of its existence." In the case of Dartmouth College against Woodward, 4 Wheat. Rep. 626, Chief Justice Marshall describes a corporation to be "an artificial being, invisible, intangible, and existing only in contemplation of law.

Being the mere creature of law," continues the judge, "it possesses only those properties which the charter of its creation confers upon it, either expressly or as incidental to its very existence. These are such as are supposed best calculated to effect the object for which it was created. Among the most important are immortality, and if the expression may be allowed, individuality; properties by which a perpetual succession of many persons are considered as the same, and may act as the single individual. They enable a corporation to manage its own affairs, and to hold property without the perplexing intricacies, the hazardous and endless necessity of perpetual conveyance for the purpose of transmitting it from hand to hand. It is chiefly for the purpose of clothing bodies of men, in succession, with these qualities and capacities, that corporations were invented, and are in use." See 2 Bl. Com. 37.

2. The words corporation and incorporation are frequently confounded, particularly in the old books. The distinction between them is, however, obvious: the one is the institution itself, the other the act by which the institution is created.

3. Corporations are divided into public and private.

4. Public corporations, which are also called political, and sometimes municipal corporations, are those which have for their object the government of a portion of the state; Civil Code of Lo. art. 420; and although in such case it involves some private interests, yet, as it is endowed with a portion of political power, the term public has been deemed appropriate.

5. Another class of public corporations are those which are founded for public, though not for political or municipal purposes, and the whole interest in which belongs to the government. The Bank of Philadelphia, for example, if the whole stock belonged exclusively to the government, would be a public corporation; but inasmuch as there are other owners of the stock, it is a private corporation. Domat's Civil Law, 452; 4 Wheat. R. 668; 9 Wheat. R. 907; 3 McCord's R. 377; 1 Hawk's R. 36; 2 Kent's Com. 222.

6. Nations or states, are denominated by publicists, bodies politic, and are said to have their affairs and interests, and to deliberate and resolve, in common. They thus become as moral persons, having an understanding and will peculiar to them- ↗

NATIONS AND STATES ARE AS
MORAL PERSONS!

(ON OUR LEVEL-NOT ABOVE)
VS

PREAMBLE OF ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION: (1781)

To all to whom these presents shall come, we the undersigned delegates of the states affixed to our names send greeting. Whereas the delegates of the United States of America in Congress assembled did on the fifteenth day of November in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and seventy-seven, and in the second year of the independence of America, agree to certain articles of confederation and perpetual union between the states of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia....

PREAMBLE OF CONSTITUTION: (1787)

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

.....

The Delegates, as they called themselves, assembled in 1781 to draw up the Articles of Confederation. In only six years they got together once again to amend the Articles of Confederation and ended up drafting the Constitution for the United States of America.

The Delegates six years later called themselves, the same human beings, WE THE PEOPLE. This phrase has been used, and especially abused, ever since the people of America, the inhabitants of the states, started to say that they, themselves, were the PEOPLE mentioned in the preamble of the Constitution.

It should be obvious to anyone who takes the time to compare the two documents that the Delegates in the preamble to the Articles of Confederation are the same PEOPLE to which they refer in the preamble of the Constitution. They are referring to themselves and not to any of the free PEOPLE that inhabit the states mentioned by name in the first document.

That means that the inhabitant of a state, a free "human being" is not a "preamble citizen" and should not want to be a member of the government. The PEOPLE mentioned in the preamble were the PEOPLE in the government CORPORATION known as the UNITED STATES.

If we claim to be a "preamble citizen" we are putting ourselves into the jurisdiction of the "corporate" United States. Those Delegates were already there by vote of the inhabitants of the states that sent them.

If our people do not know who they are or where they live, how can they know where to go? The answer is that they cannot...by design.